



RINA

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

Final

“Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey”
in
Turkey

Report N° 2015-TQ-23-MD

Revision N° 1.3 Aa

**GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT**

Project Title: Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey		Country: Turkey	Estimated VERs (tCO₂e): 112,582	
Client: Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S.		Client contact: Emre SAMSUNLU		
Report No.: 2015-TQ-23-MD		Revision: 1.3 Aa	Date of this report: 18/04/2016	
Approved by (Final Report – Authorized officer signing for the DOE):  Laura Severino			Date of approval: 19/04/2016	
Methodology				
Number: ACM0002	Version: 16.0 of 28/11/2014	Title: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources	Scale Large	SS(s): 1

RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA), commissioned by Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S., has performed the validation of renewal of crediting period of the project activity “Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey” in Turkey, with regard to the relevant requirements for GS activities.

In conclusion, it is RINA's opinion that the project activity “Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey”, in “Turkey”, as described in the PDD version 09 of 08/04/2016, meets all relevant requirements for GS activities and all relevant host Party criteria and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology “ACM0002”, “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity from renewable sources”, version 16.0 of 28/11/2014.

Work carried out by: Tugce KIRATLI	☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or organizational unit responsible ☐ Strictly confidential ☐ Unrestricted distribution
--	---

Work verified by (Final Report – Scheme Manager)  Rita Valoroso	Keywords: Climate Change, Kyoto Protocol, Validation, Gold Standard
---	---

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

Abbreviations

BE	Baseline Emissions
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CDM M&P	Modalities and Procedures CDM
CDM-PCP	Clean Development Mechanism Project Cycle Procedure
CDM-PS	Clean Development Mechanism Project Standard
CDM-VVS	Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard
CH ₄	Methane
CR	Clarification Request
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CRT	Coordination and Technical Control Staff
DCI	Certification Division of RINA Services Spa
DNA	Designated National Authority
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EB	Executive Board
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ER	Emission Reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG(s)	Greenhouse gas(es)
GS	Gold Standard
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LoA	Letter of Approval
LSC	Local Stakeholder Consultation
MoV	Means of Verification
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PDD	Project Design Document
PE	Project Emission
PMUM	Market Financial Conciliation Center (Piyasa Mali Uzlastirma Merkezi)
PP(s)	Project Participant(s)
Ref.	Document Reference
RINA	RINA Services Spa
SD	Sustainability Development
SMP	Sustainability Monitoring Plan
SS(s)	Sectoral Scope(s)
TEIAS	Turkish Electricity Transmission Company
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VER	Voluntary Emission Reduction

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

Table of Contents		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	Objective	5
1.2	Scope	5
2	METHODOLOGY	5
2.1	Document Review	5
2.2	Follow-up actions	8
2.3	Resolution of outstanding issues	9
2.4	Internal quality control	11
2.5	Validation team and the technical reviewer(s)	11
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS	11
3.1	Participation	11
3.2	Project design document and Gold Standard Passport	11
3.3	Project Design	11
3.4	GS criteria – project type eligibility screen	13
3.5	GS Criteria - Pre-feasibility assessment	14
3.6	Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology	14
3.7	Project boundary and baseline identification	14
3.8	Additionality	15
3.9	GS Criteria - Sustainability assessment	16
3.10	Monitoring Plan	17
3.11	Estimation of GHG emissions	21
3.12	Environmental Impacts	21
3.13	Local stakeholder consultation	22
4	VALIDATION OPINION	23

Appendix A: Gold Standard Validation Protocol

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

1 INTRODUCTION

Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S. has commissioned RINA to carry out the validation of renewal of crediting period of the “Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey” project in Turkey.

This report summarizes the findings of the validation of renewal of crediting period of the project, performed on the basis of GS VER requirements, which refer to CDM rules, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1 Objective

The objective of the validation of renewal of crediting period is to have an independent evaluation of a project activity by a designated operational entity against the requirements of the GS VER as set out in decision 3/CMP.1, its annex and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP, on the basis of the project design document. In particular, the project's baseline, monitoring plan, and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC, GS requirements and host Party criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project design, as documented, is sound and reasonable and meets the identified criteria. Validation is a requirement for all GS projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of verified emission reductions (VERs).

1.2 Scope

The validation of renewal of crediting period scope is to review the PDD against the UNFCCC criteria for GS VER, which refers to CDM rules.

UNFCCC criteria for GS VER refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the GS VER modalities and procedures, and the subsequent decisions by the Gold Standard Foundation.

Validation is not meant to provide any consultancy towards the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may have provided input for improvement of the project design.

2 METHODOLOGY

Validation consisted of the following three phases:

- Document review;
- Follow-up actions;
- The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report.

The following sections outline each step in more detail.

2.1 Document Review

The PDD, version 09 of 08/04/2016 [/1/](#), in particular the applicability of the methodology, the baseline determination, the additionality of the project activity, the starting date of the project, the monitoring plan, the emission reduction calculations provided in the form of a spreadsheet, “CM_Yuntdag_v3_2016 01 19.xlsx” version 03 of 19/01/2016 [/5/](#), were assessed as part of the validation.

The following table lists the documentation that was reviewed during the validation.

/1/	Lifenerji: GS-PDD for project activity “Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey” in Turkey, version 09 of 08/04/2016
	Lifenerji: GS-PDD for project activity “Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey” in Turkey, version 08 of 17/02/2016
	Lifenerji: GS-PDD for project activity “Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey” in Turkey,

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

	version 07 of 19/01/2016 Lifenerji: GS-PDD for project activity "Yunttag Wind Power Project, Turkey" in Turkey, version 06 of 22/10/2015
/2/	Lifenerji: Common Practice Calculation Excel Sheet "Common-Practice_Yunttag.xlsx" in Turkey, version 01 of 14/10/2015 Lifenerji: Common Practice Calculation Excel Sheet "Common-Practice_Yunttag.xlsx" in Turkey, version 02 of 16/12/2015
/3/	DewiGmbH: Site-related Energy Yield Assessment at the Site Yunttag, No. DEWI-GER-WP11-01628-01.01 25/01/2012
/4/	CDM Executive Board: Glossary of CDM Terms version 08.0.0 of 20/02/2015
/5/	Lifenerji: Emission Reduction Calculation Spreadsheet "CM_Yunttag_v3_ 2016 01 19.xlsx" version 03 of 19/01/2016 Lifenerji: Emission Reduction Calculation Spreadsheet "CM_Yunttag_v2.xlsx" version 02 of 10/12/2015 Lifenerji: Emission Reduction Calculation Spreadsheet "CM_Yunttag.xlsx" version 01 of 06/11/2015
/6/	The Gold Standard: Requirements, version 2.2 of 01/06/2012
/7/	The Gold Standard: Toolkit and related Annexes (A – S), version 2.2 of 01/06/2012
/8/	CDM Executive Board: Clean Development Mechanism Project Standard, version 09.0 of 20/02/2015
/9/	CDM Executive Board: Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard, version 09.0 of 20/02/2015
/10/	CDM Executive Board: Baseline and monitoring methodology "ACM0002", "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", version 16.0 of 28/11/2014
/11/	CDM Executive Board: Methodological Tool "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system", version 04.0 of 04/10/2013
/12/	CDM Executive Board: Project Design Document Form for CDM Project Activities (CDM-PDD-FORM), version 01.0 of 03/08/2002 CDM Executive Board: Guidelines for Completing CDM-PDD (CDM-PDD-FORM), version 01.0 of 01/07/2004
/13/	Website: http://maindb.unfccc.int/public/country.pl?country=TR Argument: UNFCCC, Parties and Observers States, Turkey Language: English, Retrieved on: 23/11/2015
/14/	Izmir Itfaiyesi: Basic Fire Training for 13 Employees of 23/03/2015
/15/	Izmir Provincial Directorate of Environment and Forestry: EAI Not Required Certificate of 11/12/2009
/16/	Izmir Provincial Directorate of Environment and Urbanization: The Decision of EIA Not Required After the Changing of Turbine Number of 11/12/2012
/17/	Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S.: Bird Deaths Observation Form given for Koyuneli Village (Serif Kutsi AYGUN) 06/03/2015 Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S.: Bird Deaths Observation Form given for Balaban Village (Riza AKPINAR) 06/03/2015 Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S.: Bird Deaths Observation Form given for Ismailli Village (Mehmet ALTOK) 06/03/2015
/18/	Social Security Institution: Employment Declaration for All Employees, submitted on 06/11/2015
/19/	Secim OSGB: Health and Safety Trainings for 5 Employees of 10/07/2014
/20/	Secim OSGB: Health and Safety Trainings for 5 Employees of 27/01/2015
/21/	Secim OSGB: Health and Safety Trainings for 2 Employees of 18/02/2015

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

/22/	Secim OSGB: Health and Safety Trainings for 1 Employees of 31/03/2014
/23/	Energy Market Regulatory Authority: Generation License EU/325-2/457 of 04/06/2004 amended on 13/03/2013
/24/	CDM Executive Board: Methodological Tool "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", version 07.0 of 23/11/2012
/25/	RINA: Verification Report of "Yunttag Wind Power Project, Turkey", Report No. 2015-TQ-03-MD of 05/11/2015
/26/	Website: http://www.istanbul.gov.tr/?pid=9218 and http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/ Argument: United Nations: Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10/12/1948 Language: Turkish and English, Retrieved on: 25/11/2015
/27/	Website: http://webfusion.ilo.org/public/db/standards/normes/appl/appl-byCtry.cfm?lang=en&CTYCHOICE=0660 Argument: International Labour Standards: List of Ratifications of International Labour Conventions by Turkey Language: English, Retrieved on: 25/11/2015
/28/	Website: http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/21791.html Argument: Regulation on Control of Excavation Earth and Construction Wastes Language: Turkish, Retrieved on: 25/11/2015
/29/	Website: http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/20743.html Argument: Regulation on Control of Solid Wastes Language: Turkish, Retrieved on: 25/11/2015
/30/	Website: http://www.organize.com.tr/Tehlikeli-Atiklarin-Kontrolu-Yonetmeligi.pdf Argument: Regulation on Control of Hazardous Wastes Language: Turkish, Retrieved on: 25/11/2015
/31/	Website: http://mevzuat.basbakanlik.gov.tr/Metin.Aspx?MevzuatKod=7.5.14012&MevzuatIliski=0&sourceXmlSearch=g%C3%BCr%C3%BCl%C3%BC Argument: Turkish Regulation on assessment and Management of Environmental Noise Language: Turkish, Retrieved on: 25/11/2015
/32/	Website: http://www.turkishlaborlaw.com/content/view/27/77/#83 Argument: 4857 Labor Law English By Article Language: English, Retrieved on: 25/11/2015
/33/	Turkish Energy Market Regulatory Authority: Communiqué for Measurement Devices used in the Electricity Market of 22/03/2003
/34/	Gold Standard: 2-Week Issuance Review Period Feedback Document of 01/12/2015
/35/	Gold Standard: Official Development Assistance Declaration of 10/12/2015
/36/	TEIAS: Amending Protocol for Electricity Meters of 05/12/2013
/37/	TEIAS: First Index Protocol for Electricity Meter with a Serial no. 4364955 of 03/12/2013
/38/	TEIAS: First Index Protocol for Electricity Meter with a Serial no. 4364956 of 03/12/2013
/39/	TEIAS and Yunttag WPP: Record of Changing the Measurement Devices of 05/12/2013
/40/	The Ministry of Trade and Industry: Regulation of Metering and Testing of Metering Systems of 24/07/1994
/41/	Website: http://www.teias.gov.tr/T%C3%BCrkiyeElektrik%C4%B0statistikleri/istatistik2014/istatistik2014.htm Argument: Electricity Generation & Transmission Statistics of Turkey (2014) Language: Turkish/English; Retrieved on: 03/02/2016
/42/	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

	Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 1.4 “Default CO ₂ Emission Factors for Combustion”
/43/	CDM Executive Board: Methodological Tool “Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period”, version 03.0.1 of 02/03/2012

2.2 Follow-up actions

On 20/11/2015, RINA visited project site located at Bergama District of Izmir Province of Turkey to resolve questions and issues identified during the document review and to perform interviews with relevant stakeholders in the host country.

During on site visit, the closest villages (Balabanli and Ismailli Villages) were visited. The stakeholders were interviewed about the benefits and harms of the project, noise pollution and local employment. No negative feedback has been received from the stakeholders about the noise emission. They also confirmed that they are pleased to have the new roads owing to the project activity. In addition, they confirmed that there is local employment from their village in this project.

The key personnel interviewed and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table below.

	Date	Name and Role	Organization	Topic
/a/	20/11/2015	Esra KOC Carbon Consultant	Lif Enerji	Description of the project activity Baseline and Additionality
/b/	20/11/2015	Isa ALKAN Operating Manager	Innores Enerji	Emission reductions calculations Monitoring plan and monitoring arrangements
/c/	20/11/2015	Alaaddin Kanat Security (Local Employment)	Innores Enerji (Ismailli Village)	GS Sustainable Indicators Environmental and social impacts
/d/	20/11/2015	Riza AKPINAR The Mukhtar	Balabanli Village	Environmental impacts of the project activity
/e/	20/11/2015	Hatice DUMAN Stakeholder	Ismailli Village	Social impacts of the project activity
/f/	20/11/2015	Sultan TAS Stakeholder	Ismailli Village	Local Employment Noise Emission Bird Migration
/g/	20/11/2015	Ali GECIT Stakeholder	Ismailli Village	
/h/	20/11/2015	Tezcan GUNALAN Stakeholder	Ismailli Village	
/i/	20/11/2015	Hatice CINIK Stakeholder	Ismailli Village	

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

2.3 Resolution of outstanding issues

The objective of this phase of the validation is to resolve any outstanding issues which need to be clarified for RINA's positive conclusion on the project design.

To guarantee transparency a validation protocol has been customized for the project. The protocol shows in a transparent manner the requirements, means of validation and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol consists of three tables; the different columns in these tables are described in the figure below (see Figure 1). The completed validation protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

A corrective action request (CAR) is raised if one of the following occurs:

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

A clarification request (CR) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable GS VER requirements have been met.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

Figure 1 Gold Standard Validation protocol tables

Validation Protocol, Table 1 - Requirement checklist				
Checklist Question	Ref.	MoV	Comments	Conclusion
The various requirements in Table 1 are linked to checklist questions the project should meet. The checklist is organized in five different sections.	Makes reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found.	Explain how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples are document review (DR), interview or any other follow-up actions (I), cross checking (CC) with available information relating to projects, (N/A) means not applicable.	The discussion on how the conclusion is arrived at and the conclusion on the compliance with checklist question so far.	For CAR, CL and FAR see the definitions above. OK is used if the information and evidence provided is adequate to demonstrate compliance with CDM/GS requirements.

Validation Protocol, Table 2 - Resolution of Corrective Action Requests and Clarification			
Corrective action requests and/or clarification requests	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants	Validation Conclusion
The CAR and/or CLs raised in table 1 are repeated here.	Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the CAR or CL is explained.	The responses given by the project participants to address the CARs and/or CLs.	The validation team's assessment and final conclusion of the CARs and/or CLs.

Validation Protocol, Table 3 - Forward Action Requests (if no FAR the table 3 is deleted)		
Forward action request	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants Validation Conclusion
The FAR raised in table 1 is repeated here.	Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the FAR is explained.	Response by the project participants on how forward action request will be addressed prior to first verification.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

2.4 Internal quality control

All the revisions of the validation report before being submitted to the client were subjected to an independent internal technical review to confirm that all validation activities had been completed according to the pertinent RINA instructions.

The technical review was performed by a technical reviewer(s) qualified in accordance with RINA's qualification scheme GS VER validation and verification.

2.5 Validation team and the technical reviewer(s)

The validation team and the technical reviewers consist of the following personnel:

Role/Qualification	Last Name	First Name	Country
Team Leader, GS Validator, Technical Expert	Kiratli	Tugce	Turkey
Technical Reviewer	Menon	Rekha	India

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

The findings of the validation related to the project, as described in the PDD version 09 of 08/04/2016 [/1/](#), are stated in the following sections.

The validation requirements, the means of validation and the results from validating the identified criteria are documented in more detail in the validation protocol in Appendix A.

3.1 Participation

The project participant is Innorek Elektrik Uretim A.S. and is a private entity; the project is a unilateral project and hence the host country is the only Party involved in the proposed project activity. Turkey fulfils the requirements to participate in the GS VER, having ratified the Kyoto Protocol on 28/05/2009 and has put in effect on 26/08/2009 [/13/](#). However, Turkey does not have any emission reduction target; hence, it's not listed as an Annex B country of the Kyoto Protocol. The project participant is correctly listed in table 4 of the PDD and the information is consistent with the contact details provided in Appendix 1 of the PDD [/1/](#).

3.2 Project design document and Gold Standard Passport

The PDD for the project activity "Yunttag Wind Power Project, Turkey" submitted by the Innorek Elektrik Uretim A.S. has been the basis for the validation process.

RINA confirms that the above PDD is based on the currently valid PDD template [/12/](#) and is completed in accordance with the applicable guidance document "Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document Form for CDM project activities" [/12/](#) and the Gold Standard Passport is in accordance with the latest version of the Gold Standard Passport template (Annex R to Toolkit version 2.2) [/7/](#).

3.3 Project Design

Purpose and general description of the project activity

The purpose of the project activity is to install wind power plant with a total installed capacity of 60 MWe. The generated electricity will be fed to grid. The project activity does not have any public funding or Official Development Assistance (ODA) funding [/35/](#).

Project location

The project is within boundaries of Yunttag village, Bergama district of Izmir, Turkey.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

The geographical coordinates, which are presented below, have been crosschecked through the Article of License Amendment [/23/](#) and found to be consistent.

Turbine	Latitude (N)	Longitude (E)	Turbine	Latitude (N)	Longitude (E)
T1	516633	4313956	T13	515532	4311741
T2	516615	4313686	T14	515563	4311485
T3	516642	4313426	T15	515585	4311081
T4	516697	4313168	T16	515533	4310674
T5	516744	4312913	T17	515431	4310288
T6	516757	4312647	T18	516495	4314214
T7	516772	4312389	T19	515390	4311954
T8	516786	4312100	T20	516120	4311545
T9	516846	4311849	T21	516410	4311460
T10	516854	4311595	T22	515318	4309878
T11	516936	4311349	T23	515573	4309771
T12	517036	4311122	T24	517209	4311030

Scenario existing prior to the implementation of the project activity

The proposed project is a Greenfield project where no other power plant was located at the same site prior to the implementation of the project activity, which is confirmed during the on-site inspection. Scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity, Turkish grid is mainly fed by thermal power.

Technology(ies) employed

The project qualifies as a large-scale GS project activity. The project is 60 MWm/60 MWe wind power plant. The project consists of 24 turbines each having 2.5 kW capacities. Total output of the project is 60 MWe as per the Generation License [/23/](#). The turbine specifications are presented in the PDD. The turbines are N90 of the 2.5 MW output, 90m diameter and 80m hub height. There is no change in this crediting period as confirmed during on site-visit.

The project activity is a voluntary emission reduction project, which is developed under Gold Standard; hence, the transfer of technology from any Annex I Party is not applicable.

Project implementation

All turbines have been commissioned in five phases. The first commissioning phase covers 6 turbines which were commissioned on 07/03/2008, the second commissioning phase covers 11 turbines which were commissioned on 04/06/2008, the third commissioning phase covers 4 turbines which were commissioned on 27/09/2011, the fourth commissioning phase covers 2 turbines which were commissioned on 18/01/2012, the fifth commissioning phase covers 1 turbine which was commissioned on 29/01/2014 as confirmed through the previous verification report performed by RINA [/25/](#).

Crediting period and estimated Emission Reductions

According to the "Gold Standard Procedures for the Renewal of a Crediting Period" Annex Z of the Gold Standard [/7/](#), the start date of the renewed crediting period is defined as the first day after the end date of the previous crediting period, provided the application for a renewal of the crediting period is submitted to Gold Standard prior to the end of the previous crediting period.

In the case the application for renewal of the crediting period is not submitted to Gold Standard prior to the end of the previous crediting period, but is submitted within one year, than the start date of the renewed crediting period will be the date when the 4-week review period ends. The reason for delay in the submission of the application for renewal of the crediting period has to be justified by the Project Representative.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

If the application for renewal of the crediting period is not submitted to Gold Standard within one year after the end of the previous crediting period, the crediting period will not be renewed. Therefore, the estimated crediting start date of the project activity is 21/03/2016.

Contribution to sustainable development

The project will reduce CO₂ due to avoidance of fossil fuel combustion. All employees will be trained according to the requirements. Training records for the local workers will be provided such as occupational health and safety trainings, security training renewal cards.

RINA was able to verify all the documented evidence listed above during the validation of renewal of crediting period process and can confirm that data and considerations are complete and accurate. Moreover RINA confirms that the description of the proposed GS project activity, as contained in the PDD sufficiently covers all relevant elements, is accurate and complete and that it provides the reader with a clear understanding of the nature of the proposed GS project activity.

3.4 GS criteria – project type eligibility screen

The project type eligibility is assessed as per the GS Toolkit [/7/](#) which is explained below:

Scale of project activity

The project activity is a large scale VER project as the total installed capacity of the project activity exceeds the 15 MW as confirmed through the Generation License [/23/](#), which is in accordance with the GS Requirements [/6/](#) as defined in the PDD [/1/](#).

Host country or state

The host party of the project activity is Turkey who has ratified the Kyoto Protocol on 28/05/2009 and has put in effect on 26/08/2009 [/13/](#). As Turkey was neither a Party of UNFCCC at the time the Kyoto Protocol was adopted, nor included in the Annex B of the Protocol which defined quantified emissions limitation or reduction commitments for Annex I parties. Hence, Turkey does not have a quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment in the first commitment period over the period of 2008-2012 under the Protocol. This also means that 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 is not required.

Type of project activity

Proposed project activity generates electricity using renewable wind energy and transfers to the national grid. The project activity fits into the renewable energy supply category, as defined in the GS Toolkit version 2.2 of 01/06/2012 [/7/](#).

Greenhouse gases

The greenhouse gas due to project activity is defined as CO₂ which is eligible under Gold Standard.

Official Development Assistance (ODA)

The project owner has signed ODA declaration [/35/](#).

Project timeframe

The Project was not announced to be going ahead without the revenues from the sales of carbon credits as explained in the PDD [/1/](#).

Other Certification Schemes

The project is not registered under another voluntary carbon crediting scheme.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

3.5 GS Criteria - Pre-feasibility assessment

As per the GS Toolkit version 2.2 of 01/06/2012 [/7/](#), pre-feasibility assessment is not required for the proposed project activity, as described in the following:

- The proposed project does not apply for retroactive registration;
- The project activity is the installation of wind power plant which does not be required pre-feasibility assessment as per the GS Annexes C to Toolkit version 2.2 of 01/06/2012 [/7/](#).
- The project is not being rejected for registration by the UNFCCC, which can be confirmed by verifying the UNFCCC website.

3.6 Application of selected baseline and monitoring methodology

Project activity eligibility

The project correctly applies the approved baseline and monitoring methodology “ACM0002”, “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity from renewable sources”, version 16.0 of 28/11/2014 [/10/](#).

The proposed project activity meets the criteria defined in the baseline methodology as it ensures that:

- The project activity is the installation of a new wind power plant at a site where no renewable power plant was operated prior to the implementation of the project. The project is a Greenfield plant as validated through the site visit.
- The installed capacity of the project activity is 60 MWm/60 MWe that is larger than the 15 MW as validated through the Generation License [/23/](#).
- The proposed project activity does not involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of project activity as confirmed during the site visit.
- The proposed project activity does not involve combined heat and power (co-generation) systems as confirmed during on-site visit.
- The proposed project activity does not involve addition of renewable energy generation units at an existing renewable power generation facility.
- The proposed project activity does not involve biomass fired power plants.
- The project activity is not retrofit or replacement project. The project is a Greenfield plant as validated through the site visit.

The project activity applies the following methodological tools:

- Methodological Tool “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system”, version 04.0 of 04/10/2013 [/11/](#)
- Methodological Tool “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”, version 07.0.0 of 23/11/2012 [/24/](#)
- Methodological Tool “Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period, version 03.0.1 of 02/03/2012 [/43/](#)

and meets the defined criteria as it ensures that:

- Additionality tool is applicable to the project activity since Gold Standard VER project activities, of whatever scale and type, are required to use either UNFCCC-approved or a Gold Standard-approved additionality tool to demonstrate project additionality [/24/](#).
- Baseline tool is applicable to the project activity since the project activity supplies electricity to the national grid [/11/](#).

RINA hereby confirms that the selected baseline and monitoring methodology has been previously approved by the CDM Executive Board and allowed the use of GS Board, and is applicable to the Project, which complies with all the applicability conditions therein and the selected version is valid at the time of submission of the proposed project activity for registration. It is also confirmed that the

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

methodology is correctly applied by comparing it with the actual text of the applicable version of the methodology.

3.7 Project boundary and baseline identification

3.7.1 Project boundary

According to the approved baseline and monitoring methodology “ACM0002”, “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity from renewable sources”, version 16.0 of 28/11/2014 [/10/](#) the project boundary includes the project power plant and all power plants connected physically to the electricity system that the project is connected to.

Emissions sources included in the project boundary are shown in the table below:

	GHGs involved	Description
Baseline emissions	CO ₂	CO ₂ emission from fossil fuel fired power plant that are displaced due to project activity.
Project emissions	NA	Project emissions are neglected since the project activity is a wind power plant in line with the ACM0002 /10/ .
Leakage	NA	Since energy generating equipment is not transferred from or to another activity as validated through the previous verification report /25/ .

Emission sources which are not addressed by the applied methodology and which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emissions reduction have not been identified.

By checking the information by the physical site, RINA can confirm that all the emission sources, gases have been included in the project boundary, and the description in the PDD is accurate and complete, and also that the selected sources and gases are justified for the proposed project activity.

3.7.2 Baseline identification

According to the approved baseline methodology ACM0002 [/10/](#), the baseline scenario is “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 into the grid”. Since the baseline is defined by the approved methodology, no further analysis is required as per the paragraph 124 of the VVS [/9/](#).

The approved baseline methodology “Grid connected renewable electricity generation” 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 project activity.

3.8 Additionality

According to the GS Requirements [/6/](#), the additionality of the project has been established applying the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”, version 07.0 of 23/11/2012 [/24/](#).

The above opinion of RINA to the additionality of the proposed project is further explicitly explained in the following steps.

3.8.1 Prior consideration of the clean development mechanism

Project starting date

The starting date of the project activity was defined as November 2007 according to the PDD prepared for the previous crediting period.

Prior consideration

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

The project activity is in the crediting period renewal. The date of the first crediting period is 07/03/2008 to 06/03/2015. The second crediting period is expected to start in 21/03/2016. Therefore, there is no need to check the prior consideration of the project activity.

3.8.2 Identification of alternatives

According to the approved baseline methodology ACM0002 /10/, the baseline scenario is “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 into the grid.” and since it is prescribed in the approved methodology no further analysis is required as per para 124 of the CDM-VVS /9/. The project proponent has justified the selection of the baseline scenario in line with the applied methodology and the same is deemed reasonable.

3.8.3 Investment analysis

Since the project activity is in the second crediting period, there is no need for the investment analysis.

3.8.4 Barrier analysis

The barrier analysis is applied to clearly demonstrate that the project activity is unlikely to be financially/economically attractive without the revenue from the sale of VERs during the validation in the first crediting period.

3.8.5 Common practice analysis

According to the methodological tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality /24/, the common practice analysis shall be conducted applying the following steps:

Step 1: The applicable output range is calculated as +/-50% of the capacity of the project activity in line with the tool. The project comprises an installed capacity of 60 MWe; therefore, the applicable output range is 30 MWe to 90 MWe.

Step 2: The applicable geographical area for the proposed project covers the entire host country (Turkey) as the default area specified in the guideline. All plants that deliver the same output, within the applicable output range calculated in Step 1, as the proposed project activity and have started commercial operation before the start date of the project are defined as N_{all} . The total number of N_{all} is calculated as 0 in the “Common-Practice_Yunttag_v2.xlsx” common practice calculation spreadsheet /2/.

Step 3: The power plants apply technologies different than the technology applied in the proposed project activity are identified as N_{diff} . Thus, N_{diff} is therefore the same as N_{all} .

Step 4: Factor $F = (1 - N_{diff}) / N_{all}$ representing the share of plants using technology similar to the technology used in the proposed project activity in all plants that deliver the same output or capacity as the proposed project activity.

The $N_{all}-N_{diff}$ is calculated as 0, which are not greater than 3. Therefore, the project is not common practice.

3.8.6 Conclusion

RINA can confirm that all data, rationales, assumptions, justifications and documentation provided by the project participants to support demonstration of additionality are credible and reliable.

By assessing the evidences presented and cross-checking the information contained in, RINA considers the reasoning for the proposed project additionality demonstration is credible and reasonable i.e. the proposed project has the ability to reduce anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered GS project activity.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

3.9 GS Criteria - Sustainability assessment

The project activity supports the sustainable development by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants comparing to baseline scenario and creating job opportunities during the construction and the operation phase.

The safeguarding principles and sustainability development indicator are assessed as explained below.

Based on the review of GS Local Stakeholder Consultation Report Review Feedback of 13/01/2014 /34/, a FAR was identified. This is also determined in the validation report to monitor during verification period.

3.9.1 Do no harm assessment

The risk of the project that could have harmful impacts has been assessed under “Do no harm assessment” section in GS Passport /2/. The “Do no harm assessment” is based on the UNDP (United Nations Development Program) safeguarding principles. All the safeguarding principles are assessed in terms of risk, and the explanations and references are provided for each principle to justify the evaluation of the degree of risk.

Human Rights

All safeguarding principles listed under “Human Rights” are scored low risk. The host country has ratified the European Convention on Human Rights. The project is located in degraded pastureland due to animal husbandry; the project owner will apply to provincial directorate of Food, Agriculture and Husbandry in order to change the status category of pastureland as confirmed during on site visit via interviews with stakeholders. The project activity does not have any impact on the cultural and archaeological heritage.

Labour Standards

All safeguarding principles listed under “Labour Standards” are scored low risk. The project activity complies with the ILO Convention /27/.

Environmental Protection

All safeguarding principles listed under “Environmental Protection” are scored low risk. From this project activity there is no significant negative influence into environment and social area. The every kind of waste will be disposal as per the related regulation of Environmental Law. The project activity is not located in an area, which is legally protected, officially proposed for protection, identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or recognized as protected by traditional local communities as confirmed during the site visit.

Anti-Corruption

The anti-corruption safeguarding principles are scored low. The project does not involve and is not in complicit in corruption. Turkey is a party to United Nation Convention against Corruption /26/.

3.9.2 Sustainable development matrix

The GS indicators of sustainable development are defined as per the Annex I of the GS Toolkit /7/. The indicators are connected to the localized Millennium Development Goals as per the Annex I of the GS Toolkit /7/. The justification for choice of the parameters was provided in the PDD. The defined the GS indicators in the SD matrix which are in line with the Annex I of the GS Toolkit /7/ are given below including their scores.

Air Quality (+2)

Parameter: CO and NMVOC emissions

Due to avoidance of fossil fuel combustion, these emissions will be reduced in parallel to reduced CO₂. The parameter is scored positive and will be monitored.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

Water Quality and Quantity (0)

Parameter: Disposal of waste water

Water to be used in the plant is being purchased from the villagers. Municipal water is transferred with the tanker trucks. Waste water is collected in the cesspool and then transferred with sewage trucks. This parameter is scored neutral and will be monitored.

Soil condition (0)

Parameter: Tree cutting, road construction, waste oil and garbage

No trees have to be cut for the project, neither for the turbine sites nor for the infrastructure. For the renewable energy projects, especially wind power plants, does not have any excavated soils during the construction period. The excavated soil will be used to fill material. The turbine supplier company is responsible from the hazardous service and maintenance waste oils. Garbage is being collected by the municipality. The parameter is scored neutral and will be monitored.

Other Pollutants (0)

Parameter: Noise

The construction phase of the project activity had been finished and because of the distance between the village and the turbines, there is no complaint from the stakeholders as confirmed through the interviews. The parameter is scored neutral and will not be monitored.

Biodiversity (0)

Parameter: Impact on birds

The project activity is not on the bird migration route. The parameter is scored neutral and will be monitored.

Quality of Employment (+2)

Parameter: Trainings

For the new crediting period, technically required trainings regarding the increment of the job quality of the employees will continue to be carried out. The parameter is scored positive and will be monitored.

Livelihood of the Poor (0)

Parameter: Regional economic and infrastructural development.

Generating electricity from resources that were not used before in this region, and with this new jobs that are created, leads to an additional income for the local community. The use of domestic resources for electricity generation tends to have a positive effect on the balance of trade compared to the import of fuels and leaves the margins of the value chain as well as accordant taxes within the country. The parameter is scored neutral and will not be monitored.

Access to Energy Services (0)

Parameter: Dependency on fuel/energy Imports and environmental resources

The project will help to reduce high share of imported fossil fuel dependency of Turkey. The parameter is scored neutral and will not be monitored.

Human and institutional capacity (+1)

Parameter: Improvement in education & skills

The workers of the project will be trained and also, the company is ready to provide in kind contributions to the infrastructure improvements in the region. The parameter is scored positive and will be monitored.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

Quantitative Employment and Income Generation (+2)

Parameter: Number of employment.

The company will provide job opportunities and as a result increase income generation in the region. It is planned to hire about 13 employees constantly during the operation of the plant. The parameter is scored positive and will be monitored.

Balance of Payments and Investment (0)

Parameter: Amount of domestic & foreign direct investment

Turkey imports nearly all of natural gas consumed. The project will produce electricity from wind power, otherwise this electricity will met from Turkey's national grid which is mainly depends on imported fossil fuel fired power plants. It was a one of its kind project but now these types of projects show increase. This parameter is scored neutral and will not be monitored.

Technology Transfer and Technological Self-reliance (0)

Parameter: Self-reliance regarding the introduction of innovative technologies

Project will contribute in technology transfer to Turkey and have limited impact on development of local suppliers and know-how in the country. The parameter is scored neutral and will not be monitored.

All of the indicators have been scored positive or neutral in comparison with the baseline situation. None of the indicators has been scored negative. The project contributes positive to "environment" and "economic and social development".

It is RINA's opinion that the project complies with the sustainability assessment requirements defined in the GS Toolkit version 2.2 of 01/06/2012 [/7/](#).

3.10 Monitoring Plan

The approved baseline and monitoring methodology "ACM0002", "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity from renewable sources", version 16.0 of 28/11/2014 [/10/](#) has been applied.

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the monitoring methodology; the monitoring plan will give opportunity for real measurement of achieved emission reductions.

RINA has checked all the parameters presented in the monitoring plan against the requirements of the methodology; no deviations relevant to the project activity have been found in the plan.

RINA confirms that the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design, and the means of implementation of the monitoring plan are sufficient to ensure the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from the proposed GS project activity can be reported ex post and verified.

Parameters determined ex-ante

The ex-ante parameters that are mentioned in the methodology are included in the PDD and are provided in compliance with the methodology:

	Data/parameter	Unit	Value applied	Assessment
/1/	Operating Margin of Turkey National Grid (OM)	tCO ₂ e/MWh	0.6285	The data used to determine the OM emission factor of the grid is obtained from "Electricity Generation & Transmission Statistics of Turkey, 2014" /41/ , which is published by TEIAS. The validation of renewal of crediting period team has confirmed that this is the most updated data at the time for submission for validation of renewal of crediting period, which is

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

				considered as appropriate. The emission factors of fuels used in the calculations are based on IPCC default values at the lower limit of uncertainty at a 95% confidence interval as provided in table 1.4 of Chapter 1 of Volume 2 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories /42/, which is in line with the methodological tool, and considered as appropriate.
/2/	Build Margin of Turkey National Grid (BM)	tCO ₂ e/MWh	0.3230	The data used to determine the OM emission factor of the grid is obtained from Turkish Electrical Energy 10-Year Generation Capacity Projection, which is published by TEIAS. The validation of renewal of crediting period team has confirmed that this is the most updated data at the time for submission for validation of renewal of crediting period, which is considered as appropriate. The net energy conversion efficiencies of power unit are taken from the tool /11/ which is deemed reasonable. The emission factors of fuels used in the calculations are based on IPCC default values at the lower limit of uncertainty at a 95% confidence interval as provided in table 1.4 of Chapter 1 of Volume 2 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories /42/, which is in line with the methodological tool, and considered as appropriate.
/3/	Combined Margin of Turkey National Grid (CM)	tCO ₂ e/MWh	0.5521	The emission factor is calculated as a combined margin (CM), consisting of the combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) according to the procedures prescribed in the tool /11/.

Parameters monitored ex-post

The ex-post parameters that are mentioned in the methodology are included in the PDD and are provided in compliance with the methodology, and they will be monitored during the crediting period:

	Parameter	Description/Assessment
/1/	EG _{facility,y} (MWh/yr)	Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant to the grid in year y. The quantity of electricity supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid and the quantity of electricity delivered to the project plant/unit from the grid will be measured. Net generation will be calculated via subtracting energy delivered by the project activity to the grid for internal consumption from electricity fed to the grid. The electricity generation of the plant will be crosschecked with PMUM records that are the basis of sold electricity. Net electricity generation will be measured by two meters. The meters will comply with EMRA (Energy Market Regulatory Authority) regulation /40/. The accuracy class of the meters will be 0.5s depending on the capacity of circuit as per the "Communiqué for Measurement Devices used in the Electricity Market" /33/ as explained in the PDD /1/. The maintenance and calibration of meters are under TEIAS responsibility. If any major discrepancy occurs between the two meters, TEIAS performs necessary calibration.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

Sustainability monitoring plan

	Parameter	Description/Assessment
/1/	Air Quality	CO and NMVOC emissions will be monitored at each verification period with calculation of the net electricity generation.
/2/	Water Quality and Quantity	Waste water produced by workers will be monitored at each verification period by the sewage truck records.
/3/	Soil Condition	Collection of garbage will be monitored at each verification by the letter from the municipality.
/4/	Biodiversity	Number of observed bird strikes will be monitored annually by the letter from the mukhtar and ornithology reports.
/5/	Quality of Employment	Training records for all employees will be monitored at each verification by training attendance list and/or certificates. All the employees will attend to the appropriate trainings.
/6/	Human and institutional capacity	Training records for local employees will be monitored at each verification by occupational health and safety trainings, security training renewal cards.
/7/	Quantitative employment and income generation	Number of employees will be monitored at each verification by the employment records. It is planning to hire about 13 employees for the second crediting period.

Management system and quality assurance

The electricity generation and consumption is measured in line with the TEIAS rules and requirements /33/. The generated electricity fed to grid will be measured by two meters, which will be sealed by TEIAS. Two meters will be installed, the main meter is used for monitoring, and the secondary meter is used for quality control and back-up purposes.

The maintenance and calibration of meters are under TEIAS responsibility. If any major discrepancy occurs between the two meters, TEIAS performs necessary calibration. As per the “Regulation of Metering and Testing of Metering Systems” /40/, the meters shall be calibrated every 10 years.

The electricity generation supplied to the grid and electricity consumption from the grid is stored by PMUM on the web site. The Project owner has a password to access this data on the web site. As indicated in the PDD /1/, the monitored data will be kept for two years after the end of the crediting period or the last issuance of VERs in line with the methodology /10/.

3.11 Estimation of GHG emissions

The emission reduction ER_y by the proposed project activity during the crediting period is the difference between baseline emissions (BE_y), project emission (PE_y).

Baseline Emissions

The baseline emissions (BE_y in tCO_2e) are the product of the baseline emission factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$ in tCO_2e) times the net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid ($EG_{facility,y}$ in MWh). The baseline emission factor for the project activity is determined ex-ante as a combined margin (CM) consisting of the combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) according the methodological “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” /11/.

The OM is calculated to be tCO_2e/MWh 0.6285 and the BM is calculated to be tCO_2e/MWh 0.3230. The combined grid emission factor of the grid is determined ex-ante for the seven years crediting period and it has been calculated as weighted average ($w_{OM} = 0.75$ and $w_{BM} = 0.25$) of the operating margin emission factor and the build margin emission factor. The combined margin emission factor is calculated as $0.5521 tCO_2e/MWh$, and the net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid is estimated to be 203,900 MWh/year /25/.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

The annual baseline emissions generated by the project activity is calculated to be 112,582 tCO₂e/year.

Project Emissions

Project emissions are neglected since the project activity is a wind power plant in line with the ACM0002 [/10/](#).

Leakage

Since energy generating equipment is not transferred from or to another activity as validated through the previous verification report [/25/](#).

Emission Reductions

The emission reductions (ER_y) are calculated as the following formula:

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$$

$$ER_y = BE_y$$

$$= 112,582 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/year}$$

The annual emission reductions generated by the project activity is calculated to be 112,582 tCO₂e/year over the selected seven years renewable crediting period (second crediting period).

The estimation of the emission reductions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the PDD [/1/](#) and supporting files [/5/](#). The data sources mentioned have been verified by RINA and confirms that the GHG emissions reduction calculation is complete and transparent, and the data accuracy has been verified.

3.12 Environmental Impacts

The project activity is environmentally licensed by the competent authority. "Izmir Governorship Environment and Forestry Directorate" have issued a Certificate of EIA Exemption dated 11/12/2009 [/15/ /16/](#) based on Preliminary EIA Report. The environmental impact of the project activity is evaluated in the GS PDD [/1/](#).

3.13 Local stakeholder consultation

The local stakeholder consultation meeting was held on 25/07/2007 for the first crediting period in line with the GS Requirements [/6/ /7/](#).

For the crediting period renewal, no additional LSC is conducted. The last verification site visit for the first crediting period and the validation of renewal of crediting period site visit were performed by RINA on 06/05/2015 and 20/11/2015. During on site visit, Koyuneli, Ismailli and Balabanli villages are visited and interviews were performed with the mukhtars and the stakeholders. There is no negative feedback or complain about the project activity.

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION REPORT

4 VALIDATION OPINION

RINA Services Spa (RINA) has performed validation of renewal of crediting period of the project activity “Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey” in Turkey, with regard to the relevant requirements for GS VER activities.

The review of the project design document and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided RINA with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of the stated criteria.

The project correctly applies the approved baseline and monitoring methodology “ACM0002”, “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity from renewable sources”, version 16.0 of 28/11/2014.

By generating renewable energy from wind power plant the project results in reduction of CO₂ emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. It is demonstrated that the project is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity.

The total emission reductions from the “Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey” are estimated to be on average 112,582 tCO_{2e} per year over the selected 7 years renewable crediting period. The emission reduction forecast has been checked and it is deemed likely that the stated amount is achieved given that the underlying assumptions do not change.

The monitoring plan provides for the monitoring of the project's emission reductions and of the sustainable development indicators. The monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design and it is RINA's opinion that the project participants are able to implement the monitoring plan.

In conclusion, it is RINA's opinion that the project activity “Yuntdag Wind Power Project, Turkey” in Turkey, as described in the PDD version 09 of 08/04/2016 meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the GS VER and all relevant host Party criteria and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology “ACM0002”, “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity from renewable sources”, version 16.0 of 28/11/2014.

APPENDIX A

GOLD STANDARD VALIDATION PROTOCOL

TABLE 1 REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
A Description of Project Activity					
A.1 Title of the project activity					
A.1.1.	Does the used project title clearly enable the reader to identify the unique GS activity? Is there an indication of a revision number and the date of the revision.	/1/	DR, CC	The title of the project activity is defined as “Yunttag MW Wind Power Project, Turkey” in the PDD version 06 of 22/10/2015 /1/ which is not in line with the GS Registry. Please correct. The version and completion date of the PDD is available and in line with the current situation.	CR-1 OK
A.1.2	Does the project comply with the applicable requirements for completing the PDDs (latest version available)?	/1/ /12/	DR, CC	“Clean Development Mechanism Project Design Document Form (CDM-PDD), version 01.0 is applied. The version of the PDD is the latest version when it is submitted to GS. However, the provided PDD is not in line with the CDM-PDD version 01.0 formats. Please check.	CR-2 OK
A.1.3	Does the PDD comply with the template available (latest version)?	/1/ /12/	DR, CC	“Clean Development Mechanism Project Design Document Form (CDM-PDD), version 01.0 is applied. The version of the PDD is the latest version when it is submitted to GS.	OK
A.2 Description of the proposed project activity					
A.2.1	Does the PDD contain an accurate description of the project activity and provide the reader with a clear understanding of the precise nature of the project activity and the technical aspects of its implementation? How was the design of the project assessed?	/1/	DR, CC, I	The proposed project is a Greenfield project where no other power plant was located at the same site prior to the implementation of the project activity, which is confirmed during the on-site inspection. However, please clarify the listed issues: - The format of the dates should be revised as DD/MM/YYYY. - Please provide the GS Feedback Document related with the previous verification report.	CR-3 OK
A.2.2	Does the project activity involve alteration of existing installations? If yes, have the differences between pre-project and post-project activity been clearly described in the PDD?	/1/	DR, I	The project activity is a Greenfield project, which does not involve any alteration of existing installation as confirmed during the site visit.	OK

¹ MoV: DR document review, I interview, CC cross checking

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
A.2.3	Is all information provided consistent and in compliance with the actual situation or planning?	/1/ /23/	DR, CC	The PDD is consistent and in compliance with the planning situation. As per the PDD version 06 /1/ , the project consists of 24 wind turbines as confirmed through the generation license /23/ .	OK
A.2.8	Have the results of the sustainable development matrix been presented in the PDD?	/1/	DR	The results of the sustainable development matrix have been presented in the PDD /1/ .	OK
A.2.9	To which GS category(ies) does the project activity belong to? Is the category correctly identified and indicated? (GS Toolkit Annex C)	/1/ /6/ /7/	DR	The project activity is a large-scale project as the total installed capacity of the project activity is to exceed 15 MW which is in accordance with the GS Requirements /6/ . The project activity is a GS VER project as indicated in the PDD /1/ . The proposed project activity is considered as a Renewable Energy Project. The project activity fits into the renewable energy supply category, as defined in the GS Toolkit version 2.2 of 01/06/2012 /7/ . The project activity is to install a wind power plant to generate electricity and feed to the Turkish National power grid, the project fits into the renewable energy supply category (i.e. generation and delivery of electricity from a renewable wind power resource).	OK
A.2.10	In case of hydro projects, do the items provided in Table C-2 of the GS Toolkit Annex C have been discussed?	/1/ /7/	DR	The project is a wind power plant; hence, Table C.2 is not applicable as per the GS Toolkit /7/ .	OK
A.3 Project participants					
A.3.1	Have the Parties and project participants participating in the project been listed in tabular form in Section A.3 and are they consistent with the information detailed in Annex 1 of the PDD?	/1/	DR	The project participant has been listed in tabular form in Section A.3 as “Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S.”. It is consistent with the current situation. However, it is not discussed in the PDD that the project proponent is private or public entity.	~~CR-4~~ OK
A.3.5	Have all private/public project participants been authorized by a Party to the Kyoto Protocol?	/1/	DR	As the proposed project activity is a GS VER project, the validation of participation requirement for CDM/JI is not required.	OK
A.4 Technical description of the project					
A.4.1	Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)? Are the latitude and longitude of the site indicated (decimal points)?	/1/ /23/	DR, CC	The project is within boundaries of Izmir Province of Turkey, located at Bergama District. The latitude and longitude of the wind turbines is presented clearly in the PDD /1/ as confirmed through the Generation License /23/ .	OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
A.4.2	Is the category(ies) of the project activity correctly identified?	/1/	DR	The category of the project activity is identified correctly in the PDD /1/. The project activity is a wind power plant and considered as a Renewable Energy Project. The sectoral scope is "1 Energy Industries" as defined in Section A.4.3 of the PDD /1/.	OK
A.4.3	Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices? Would the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host Country? Is any transfer of technology from any Annex I Party involved?	/1/	DR	The turbine specifications are presented in the PDD. The turbines are N90 of the 2.5 MW output, 90m diameter and 80m hub height. There is no change in this crediting period as confirmed during on site-visit. The project activity is a voluntary emission reduction project, which is developed under Gold Standard; hence, the transfer of technology from any Annex I Party is not applicable.	OK
A.4.4	What is the expected operational lifetime of the project activity? Is it reasonable?	/1/	DR, CC	The expected operational lifetime of the project activity is defined as 20 years in the PDD. Please give a reference for the explanation. In addition, the turbine lifetime is not discussed in the PDD. Please clarify.	CR-5 OK
A.5 Public funding					
A.5.1	Does the information on public funding provided conform to the actual situation or planning as presented by the PPs?	/1/	DR	The project activity is not used public funding for the financing of the project as confirmed via interviews. However, the signed ODA declaration is not provided to the validation team.	CR-6 OK
A.5.2	If public funding from Parties included in Annex I is used for the project activity, have these Parties provided 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 these Parties?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section A.5.1 of this protocol.	CR-6 OK
A.5.3	Is the ODA Declaration available and submitted to the GS Board as per the Annex D of the GS Toolkit?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section A.5.1 of this protocol.	CR-6 OK
B. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology					
B.1 Methodology applied					
B.1.1	Does the project activity apply an approved methodology and the correct version thereof?	/1/ /10/	DR	The proposed project activity applies "ACM0002 Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 16.0.0 as indicated in the PDD /1/. The applied	CR-7 OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion												
				methodology is approved by CDM. However, in some parts of the PDD, the version of the methodology is defined as version 15.0. Please clarify.													
B.1.2	Is there any specific guidance, including the methodological tools provided by EB and has these guidance been applied?	/1/ /11/ /24/	DR	The following tools are applied: 1. Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system (version 04.0.0) /11/ . 2. Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (version 07.0.0) /24/ However, the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality, version 05.0.0" defined in Section B.1 of the PDD is not the latest version. Please clarify.	CR-8 OK												
B.1.3	How was it validated that the project activity complies with the applicability criteria?	/1/ /10/	DR, I	<table><tr><th colspan="3">Applicability of ACM0002:</th></tr><tr><th>Applicability criteria</th><th>Project activity</th><th>Criteria are met?</th></tr><tr><td>This methodology is applicable to grid-connected renewable energy power generation project activities that: (a) Install a Greenfield power plant; (b) Involve a capacity addition to (an) existing plant(s); (c) Involve a retrofit of (an) existing operating plants/units; (d) Involve a rehabilitation of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s); or (e) Involve a replacement of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s).</td><td>The project activity is the installation of wind power plant as explained in the PDD /1/.</td><td>OK</td></tr><tr><td>The project activity may include renewable energy power plant/unit of one of</td><td>The project activity is the installation of new wind turbine</td><td>OK</td></tr></table>	Applicability of ACM0002:			Applicability criteria	Project activity	Criteria are met?	This methodology is applicable to grid-connected renewable energy power generation project activities that: (a) Install a Greenfield power plant; (b) Involve a capacity addition to (an) existing plant(s); (c) Involve a retrofit of (an) existing operating plants/units; (d) Involve a rehabilitation of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s); or (e) Involve a replacement of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s).	The project activity is the installation of wind power plant as explained in the PDD /1/ .	OK	The project activity may include renewable energy power plant/unit of one of	The project activity is the installation of new wind turbine	OK	OK
Applicability of ACM0002:																	
Applicability criteria	Project activity	Criteria are met?															
This methodology is applicable to grid-connected renewable energy power generation project activities that: (a) Install a Greenfield power plant; (b) Involve a capacity addition to (an) existing plant(s); (c) Involve a retrofit of (an) existing operating plants/units; (d) Involve a rehabilitation of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s); or (e) Involve a replacement of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s).	The project activity is the installation of wind power plant as explained in the PDD /1/ .	OK															
The project activity may include renewable energy power plant/unit of one of	The project activity is the installation of new wind turbine	OK															

Checklist Question	Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
			the following types: hydro power plant/unit with or without reservoir, wind power plant/unit, geothermal power plant/unit, solar power plant/unit, wave power plant/unit or tidal power plant/unit.	generators (WTGs). Hence, meets this criterion.
			In the case of capacity additions, retrofits, rehabilitations or replacements (except for wind, solar, wave or tidal power capacity addition projects the existing plant/unit started commercial operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions and defined in the baseline emission section, and no capacity expansion, retrofit, or rehabilitation of the plant/unit has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical reference period and the implementation of the project activity.	OK
			In case of hydro power plants, one of the following conditions shall apply: (a) The project activity is implemented in existing single or multiple reservoirs, with no change	OK

Checklist Question	Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
			in the volume of any of the reservoirs; or (b) The project activity is implemented in existing single or multiple reservoirs, where the volume of the reservoir(s) is increased and the power density calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m²; or (c) The project activity results in new single or multiple reservoirs and the power density, calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m²; or (d) The project activity is an integrated hydro power project involving multiple reservoirs, where the power density for any of the reservoirs, calculated using equation (3), is lower than or equal to 4 W/m², all of the following conditions shall apply: (i) The power density calculated using the total installed capacity of the integrated project, as per equation (4), is greater than 4 W/m²; (ii) Water flow between reservoirs is not used by any other hydropower unit which is not a part of the project activity; (iii) Installed capacity of the power plant(s) with power density	

Checklist Question	Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
			lower than or equal to 4 W/m² shall be: a. Lower than or equal to 15 MW; and b. Less than 10 per cent of the total installed capacity of integrated hydro power project.	
			In the case of integrated hydro power projects, project proponent shall: (a) Demonstrate that water flow from upstream power plants/units spill directly to the downstream reservoir and that collectively constitute to the generation capacity of the integrated hydro power project; or (b) Provide an analysis of the water balance covering the water fed to power units, with all possible combinations of reservoirs and without the construction of reservoirs. The purpose of water balance is to demonstrate the requirement of specific combination of reservoirs constructed under CDM project activity for the optimization of power output. This demonstration has to be carried out in the specific scenario of water availability in different seasons to optimize the water flow at the inlet of power units. Therefore this	The project activity is not a hydro power plant. Hence this applicability criterion is not relevant to the project activity. OK

Checklist Question	Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
			water balance will take into account seasonal flows from river, tributaries (if any), and rainfall for minimum five years prior to implementation of CDM project activity.	
			The methodology is not applicable to: (a) Project activities that involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of the project activity, since in this case the baseline may be the continued use of fossil fuels at the site; (b) Biomass fired power plants/units	Project activity does not involve: • Switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of the project activity. • Biomass fired plants. Hence this criterion is not applicable.
			In the case of retrofits, rehabilitations, 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 and undertaking business as usual maintenance”.	OK
			This tool may be applied to estimate the OM, BM and/or CM when calculating	The project activity substitutes grid electricity by

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
				baseline emissions for a project activity that substitutes grid electricity, i.e. where a project activity supplies electricity to a grid or a project activity that results in savings of electricity that would have been provided by the grid (e.g. demand-side energy efficiency projects). supplying renewable power to grid. Hence this criterion is applicable.	
				In case of CDM projects the tool is not applicable if the project electricity system is located partially or totally in an Annex I country. Project electricity system is not located in an Annex I country.	OK
B.1.4	Is the selected baseline one of the baseline(s) described in the methodology and this hence confirms the applicability of the methodology?	/1/ /10/	DR	The proposed project activity applies “Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 16.0.0 as indicated in the PDD /1/ . The applied methodology is approved by CDM.	OK
B.2 Project boundary					
B.2.1	Is the project boundary are clearly defined and in accordance with the applied methodology?	/1/ /10/ /12/	DR	The project boundary clearly defined in accordance with the applied methodology, ACM0002 /10/. A flow diagram of the project boundary, physically delineating the project activity is presented in the PDD as per the “Guidelines for completing the project design document form for CDM project activities” /12/.	OK
B.2.2	What are the project's system boundaries (components and facilities used to mitigate GHGs)?	/1/ /23/	DR	The project system boundary consists of 24 wind turbines, which will be connected physically to the grid. It could be confirmed through the Generation License /23/ .	OK
B.2.3	Which sources are identified for the project? Does the identified project boundary cover all possible sources linked to the project activity?	/1/ /10/	DR	Project boundary is identified the PDD version 01 /1/ for baseline and project activity. The source of baseline emission CO₂ emissions are included in baseline calculation since fossil fuels fired for electricity generation. CH₄ and N₂O emissions are neglected regarding to the methodology. Project emissions are neglected regarding to the	OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
				methodology since the project activity is a wind power plant.	
B.2.4	In case of grid connected electricity project: is the relevant grid correctly identified in accordance with the latest version of tool to calculate emission factor of electricity system and the underlying methodology?	/1/ /11/	DR	The geographic and system boundaries for the relevant electricity grid can be clearly identified and information on the characteristics of the grid is available in the PDD version 01 /1/ in accordance with the “Tool to calculate emission factor of electricity system” /11/.	OK
B.2.5	Does the project involve other emissions sources not foreseen by the methodologies that may question the applicability of the methodology? Do these sources contribute by more than 1% to the estimated emission reductions of the project?	/1/ /10/	DR	The PDD version 01 /1/ mentioned whether the project involve other emission sources not foreseen by the methodology, which contribute by more than 1% (e.g. back up diesel generators).	OK
B.3 Identification of the Baseline Scenario					
B.3.1	Which baseline scenarios have been identified? Is the list of the baseline scenarios complete? Does the PDD follow the steps to determine the baseline scenario required by the methodology/tool?	/1/ /10/	DR	The baseline scenario for the project activity is already defined in the applied methodology. According to the approved simplified baseline methodology AMS-I.D. /10/, the baseline scenario is defined as “the electricity delivered to the grid by the project would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants”. Since the baseline is defined by the approved methodology, no further analysis is requested.	OK
B.3.2	How have the other baseline scenarios been eliminated in order to determine the baseline?	/1/ /10/	DR	The baseline scenario for the project activity is already defined in the applied methodology.	OK
B.3.3	What is the baseline scenario? Is the determination of the baseline scenario in accordance with the guidance in the methodology?	/1/ /10/	DR	The baseline scenario for the project activity is already defined in the applied methodology.	OK
B.3.4	Has the baseline scenario been determined using conservative assumptions? Does the baseline scenario sufficiently take into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies (E+ / E-), macro-economic trends and political aspirations?	/1/ /10/	DR	The baseline scenario for the project activity is already defined in the applied methodology.	OK
B.4 Additionality					
B.4.1	What tool does the project use to assess additionality? Is this in line with the methodology?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.2	What is the project additionality mainly based on?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
B.4.3 Prior consideration					
B.4.3.1	What is the starting date of the proposed project activity? Is it in accordance with the CDM Glossary of Terms?	/1/ /25/	DR, CC, I	The starting date of the project activity was defined as November 2007 according to the PDD prepared for the previous crediting period.	OK
B.4.3.2	Is the project activity a new project activity or existing project?	/1/	DR, I	The project activity is a new existing project as confirmed during the site visit. The project activity is in the second crediting period.	OK
B.4.3.3	Does the timeline of the project confirm that continuous actions in parallel with the implementation were taken to secure project status? Please specify the gap between the documented evidences.	/1/	DR	The timeline of the project is discussed in the PDD /1/. However, there is no explanation about the time of the second crediting period. Please add.	~~CR-9~~ OK
B.4.4 Investment analysis					
B.4.4.1	What is the analysis method used to determine whether the proposed project activity is not (a) the most economically or financially attractive; or (b) economically or financially feasible, without the revenue from the sale of certified emission reductions?	/1/	DR	In Section B.3 of the PDD; it is mentioned that "In the following, the investment analysis is applied to clearly demonstrate that the project activity is unlikely to be financially/economically attractive without the revenue from the sale of VERs". However, in Step 2 of the same part of the PDD, it is mentioned that "Investment analysis is not applied". Please clarify.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.2	What the financial indicator is used?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.3	If a benchmark is used, is it ensured that it is selected in accordance with the requirements of the EB guidelines and it represents standard returns in the market? Is the benchmark suitable for the type of financial indicator presented? Is it ensured the any risk premiums applied in determining the benchmark reflect the risks associated with the project type or activity?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.4	Is the investment analysis carried out in accordance with specific guidance from EB? Is the investment analysis complete and accurate? Is the investment analysis provided in a spreadsheet version? Are all the formulas used readable and all	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
	relevant cell be viewable and unprotected?				
B.4.4.5	Cross-check the parameters used in the financial analysis against third party or publicly available sources (all parameters used as input values shall be cross-checked and assessed).	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.6	Are the input values used in the investment analysis valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision taken by the PP?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.7	Where applicable, the PFL has been defined ex-ante according to the applicable EB guideline?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.8	Does the time period of the investment analysis reflect the expected operation of the underlying project activity (technical lifetime)?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.9	Does the fair value of the project activity assets is included at the end of the assessment period as a cashflow in the final year? Is the fair value calculated in accordance with local accounting regulations where available or international best practice?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.10	Does the income tax calculation take depreciation into account? Is the depreciation year in accordance with normal accounting practice in the Host Country	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.11	Sensitivity analysis: have the key parameters contributing to more than 20% of the revenue/costs during operating or implementation been identified?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.11	Sensitivity analysis: is the range of variations is reasonable in the project activity? The main parameters can be changed for the different project category.	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.4.12	Have the key parameters been varied to reach the benchmark and the likelihood of this happening been justified to be small?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.5 Barrier analysis					
B.4.5.1	Are the barriers identified complimentary to a potential investment analysis?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
B.4.5.2	How were the investment barriers assessed to be real?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.5.3	How were the technological barriers assessed to be real?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.5.4	How were the other barriers assessed to be real?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.5.5	Barriers due to prevailing practice (First of its kind): does the project apply measures currently covered in the framework (fuel and feedstock switch, switch of technology with or without change of energy source, methane destruction, methane formation avoidance)?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.5.6	Barriers due to prevailing practice (First of its kind): do the technologies deliver the same output and differ by at least of energy source/fuel, feed stock, size of installation?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.5.7	Barriers due to prevailing practice (First of its kind): does the applicable geographical area is in compliance with the definition as per the EB guideline?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.5.8	Is the project activity prevented by the identified barriers and at least one of the possible alternatives to the project activity is feasible under the same circumstances?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.5.9	How the GS can alleviate the identified barriers?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section B.4.4.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-1~~ OK
B.4.6 Common practice analysis					
B.4.6.1	Does the project apply measures currently covered in the framework (fuel and feedstock switch, switch of technology with or without change of energy source, methane destruction, methane formation avoidance)?	/1/ /24/	DR	The project does apply the measures described in the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” /24/ .	OK
B.4.6.2	Do the technologies deliver the same output and differ by at least of energy source/fuel, feed stock, size of installation, investment climate in the date of the investment decision, other features?	/1/ /2/	DR, CC	In calculating the capacity or output range as +/-50% of the total design of the project activity, 60 MW is chosen. However, in choosing the output range in the calculation given in the excel sheet /2/ , “project production capacity” is used instead of “installed power”. Please clarify. In addition,	~~CAR-2~~ OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
				please clarify that if the N_{all} is found as "0" zero in the calculations, how can N_{diff} found as "1".	
B.4.6.3	Does the applicable geographical area is in compliance with the definition as per the EB guideline?	/1/ /2/	DR, CC	Please refer to Section B.4.6.2 of this protocol.	CAR-2 OK
B.4.6.4	How many similar non-CDM-projects exist in the region within the scope?	/1/ /2/	DR, CC	Please refer to Section B.4.6.2 of this protocol.	CAR-2 OK
B.4.6.5	What is the data source(s) used for the common practice analysis?	/1/ /2/	DR, CC	Please refer to Section B.4.6.2 of this protocol.	CAR-2 OK
B.4.7 Do No Harm Assessment					
B.4.7.1	Does the project respects internationally proclaimed human rights including dignity, cultural property and uniqueness of indigenous people? Does the project is not complicit in Human Rights abuses?	/1/ /6/ /7/ /26/	DR, CC	The project respects internationally proclaimed human rights including dignity, cultural property and uniqueness of indigenous people. The project is not complicit in Human Rights abuses. Turkey has ratified the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" /26/.	OK
B.4.7.2	Does not the project involve and is not complicit in involuntary resettlement?	/1/ /6/ /7/	DR, CC, I	The project does not involve and is not complicit in involuntary resettlement. It is confirmed during the site visit and via interviews with the stakeholders that the project does not result in any person's relocation.	OK
B.4.7.3	Does not the project involve and is not complicit in the alteration damage or removal of any critical cultural heritage?	/1/ /6/ /7/	DR, CC	The project does not involve and is not complicit in the alteration damage or removal of any critical cultural heritage as confirmed during the site visit.	OK
B.4.7.4	Does the project respects the employees' freedom of association and their right to collective bargaining and is not complicit in restrictions of these freedoms and rights?	/1/ /6/ /7/ /27/	DR, CC	The project respects the employees' freedom of association and their right to collective bargaining and is not complicit in restrictions of these freedoms and rights. Turkey has ratified ILO Convention 87 (Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention) and ILO Convention 98 (Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention) /27/.	OK
B.4.7.5	Does not the project involve and is not complicit in any form of forces compulsory labour?	/1/ /6/ /7/ /27/	DR, CC	The project does not involve and is not complicit in any form of forces compulsory labour. Turkey has ratified ILO Convention 29 (Forced Labour Convention) /27/.	OK
B.4.7.6	Does not the project employ and is not complicit in any form of child labour?	/1/ /6/ /7/ /27/	DR, CC	The project does not employ and is not complicit in any form of child labour. Turkey has ratified ILO Convention 138 (Minimum Age Convention) and 182 (Worst Forms of Child	OK

Checklist Question	Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
B.4.7.7	Does not the project involve and is not complicit in any form of discrimination based on gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or any other basis?	/1/ /6/ /7/ /27/	DR, CC Labour Convention) /27/ . The project does involve and is not complicit in any form of discrimination based on gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or any other basis. Turkey has ratified ILO Convention 100 (Equal Remuneration Convention) and 111 (Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation) Convention) /27/ .	OK
B.4.7.8	Does the project provide workers with a safe and healthy work environment and is not complicit in exposing workers to unsafe or unhealthy work environments?	/1/ /6/ /7/ /27/	DR, CC, I The project provides workers with a safe and healthy work environment and is not complicit in exposing workers to unsafe or unhealthy work environments. Turkey has ratified ILO Convention 155 (Occupational. Safety and Health Convention) /27/ .	OK
B.4.7.9	Does the project takes a precautionary approach in regard to environmental challenges and is not complicit in practices contrary to the precautionary principle?	/1/ /6/ /7/	DR, I There is no significant negative influence into environment and social area. The every kind of waste will be disposal as per the related regulation of Environmental Law.	OK
B.4.7.10	Does not the project involve and is not complicit in significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats, including those that are legally protected, officially proposed for protection, identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or recognized as protected by traditional local communities?	/1/ /6/ /7/	DR The project activity is not located in an area, which is legally protected, officially proposed for protection, identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or recognized as protected by traditional local communities as confirmed during the site visit.	OK
B.4.7.11	Does not the project involve and is not in complicit in corruption?	/1/ /6/ /7/ /27/	DR, CC The project does not involve and is not in complicit in corruption. Turkey is a party to United Nation Convention against Corruption /27/ .	OK
B.4.8 Sustainability Assessment				
B.4.8.1	Are the GS indicators of sustainable development identified according to the Annex I of the GS Toolkit? <i>(list the identified indicators)</i>	/2/ /6/ /7/	DR, CC The GS indicators of sustainable development are defined as per the Annex I of the GS Toolkit /7/ . The indicators are connected to the localized Millennium Development Goals as per the Annex I of the GS Toolkit. The identified indicators under Sustainable Development Matrix of GS Passport is as follows: – Air quality – Water quality and quantity – Soil condition	OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
				- Other pollutants - Biodiversity - Employment (including job quality) - Livelihood of the poor - Access to energy services - Human and institutional capacity - Employment (number) - Balance of payments - Technology self-reliance	
B.4.8.2	Are the justification choices documented? Which data sources have been provided for references?	/1/ /6/ /7/ /28/ /29/ /30/ /31/ /32/	DR	The justification choices are documented in the PDD /1/ . The SD matrix is mainly based on Regulations web site /28/ /29/ /30/ /31/ /32/ .	OK
B.4.8.3	Which parameters have been identified for the selected indicators?	/1/ /7/	DR, CC	The defined the GS indicators in the SD matrix should include the chosen parameter, baseline and future target for the new crediting period. Please check all the parameters and discuss them for the second crediting period.	~~CAR-3~~ OK
B.4.9 Conclusion					
B.4.9.1	What is the conclusion with regard to the additionality of the project activity?	/1/ /2/ /24/ /25/	DR, I	Please refer to Section B.4.3, B.4.4, B.4.5 and B.4.6 of this validation protocol.	~~CR-9~~ ~~CAR-1~~ ~~CAR-2~~ OK
B.5 Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions					
B.5.1 Baseline emissions					
B.5.1.1	Are the steps and equations applied to calculate the baseline emissions in compliance with the requirements of selected baseline and monitoring methodology?	/1/ /5/ /10/ /11/	DR, CC	The calculation of baseline emission reductions is carried out in a conservative manner providing documentation and references to data sources. An approved CDM methodology, ACM0002 /10/ and methodological tool “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system /11/ ” is applied. The official published data, TEIAS statistics, are used to determine the emission factor of the grid. The emission factor is calculated as a combined margin (CM), consisting of the combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) according to the procedures prescribed in the tool.	~~CAR-4~~ OK

Checklist Question	Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
			OM Calculation Option (a) simple OM is selected to calculate the operating margin (OM) emission factor of the grid as per the tool since the average share of electricity generation by low-cost/must-run plants for five most recent years is found to be less than 50%. The ex-ante option is selected for OM, from the years 2011 to 2013. However, more recent data is available in the TEIAS Statistics. Please revise the calculation. BM Calculation The build margin (BM) emission factor calculation is in line with the latest version of methodological tool "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system /11/". CM Calculation The combined Margin is calculated for Wind and solar power generation project activities: $w_{OM} = 0.75$ and $w_{BM} = 0.25$ for the first crediting period and for subsequent crediting periods.	
B.5.1.2	Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating the baseline emissions and are the uncertainty estimates properly addressed? Are all the values used in the PDD considered reasonable in the context of the proposed project activity?	/1/ /5/ /10/ /11/	DR, CC Please refer to Section B.5.1.1 of the protocol.	~~CAR-4~~ OK
B.5.1.3	Baseline Emissions estimated	/1/ /5/ /10/ /11/	DR, CC Please refer to Section B.5.1.1 of the protocol.	~~CAR-4~~ OK
B.5.2 Project emissions				
B.5.2.1	Are the steps and equations applied to calculate the project emissions in compliance with the requirements of selected baseline and monitoring methodology? Are all the values used in the PDD considered reasonable in the context of the proposed project activity?	/1/ /6/ /10/	DR Project emissions are neglected since the project activity is a wind power plant in line with the ACM0002 /10/ .	OK
B.5.2.2	Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating the project emissions and are the uncertainty estimates properly addressed?	/1/ /6/ /10/	DR Project emissions are neglected since the project activity is a wind power plant in line with the ACM0002 /10/ .	OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
B.5.2.3	Project emissions estimated	/1/ /6/ /10/	DR	Project emissions are neglected since the project activity is a wind power plant in line with the ACM0002 /10/.	OK
B.5.3 Leakage					
B.5.3.1	Are the steps and equations applied to calculate the leakage in compliance with the requirements of selected baseline and monitoring methodology? Are all the values used in the PDD considered reasonable in the context of the proposed project activity?	/1/ /10/	DR	The leakage emissions are neglected as per ACM0002 /10/.	OK
B.5.3.2	Have conservative assumptions been used when calculating the leakage and are the uncertainty estimates properly addressed?	/1/ /10/	DR	Please refer to Section B.5.3.1 of the protocol.	OK
B.5.3.3	Leakage estimated	/1/ /10/	DR	Please refer to Section B.5.3.1 of the protocol.	OK
B.5.4 Emission reductions					
B.5.4.1	Has the methodology been correctly applied to calculate the emission reductions and can this be replicated by the data provided in the PDD and supporting files to be submitted for registration?	/1/ /10/	DR, CC	The ex-ante emission reduction has been calculated as following equation in line with the ACM0002 /10/: $ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$ The project emission and leakage emissions are zero for the project activity. Therefore, the emission reduction equals to baseline emissions.	OK
B.5.4.2	Are all the assumptions and data used by the project participants listed in the PDD including their references and sources?	/1/ /10/	DR, CC	Please refer to Section B.5.1.1 of the protocol.	CAR-4 OK
B.5.4.3	Is all the documentation used by the project participants as the basis for assumptions and source of data quoted and interpreted in the PDD?	/1/ /5/ /10/	DR, CC	Please refer to Section B.5.1.1 of the protocol.	CAR-4 OK
B.5.4.4	Emission Reductions estimated	/1/ /5/ /10/	DR, CC	Please refer to Section B.5.1.1 of the protocol.	CAR-4 OK
B.6 Monitoring plan					
B.6.1 Parameters ex-ante					
B.6.1.1	Does the monitoring plan contain the list of all parameters required by the approved methodology and by the applicable methodological tool?	/1/ /10/ /11/	DR, CC	Please check and revise all the parameters that are available at validation with their links and values according to the most recent data. In addition, please be sure that the links are in line with the given calculation excel sheet.	CAR-5 OK
B.6.1.2	How were the parameters available at validation verified?	/1/ /10/ /11/	DR,	Please refer to Section B.6.1.1 of this protocol.	CAR-5

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
			CC		OK
B.6.1.3	Which default data have been selected and applied?	/1/ /10/ /11/	DR	Please refer to Section B.6.1.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-5~~ OK
B.6.1.4	Are all the values used in the PDD considered reasonable in the context of the proposed project activity?	/1/ /10/ /11/	DR, CC	Please refer to Section B.6.1.1 of this protocol.	~~CAR-5~~ OK
B.6.2 Parameters ex-post					
B.6.2.1	Does the monitoring plan described in the PDD comply with the requirements of the methodology and the applicable methodological tool?	/1/ /10/ /11/	DR, CC	The monitoring plan described in the PDD complies with the requirements of the methodology /10/ and the applicable methodological tool /11/.	OK
B.6.2.2	Does the monitoring plan contain all necessary parameters and are they clearly described?	/1/ /10/ /11/	DR, CC	The monitoring plan includes all necessary data and parameters ex-post required by the applied methodology /10/ and the applicable methodological tool /11/. The only parameter included to the monitoring plan is "Quantity of Net Electricity Delivered to the Grid (GEN _y)". However, the name of the parameter is not in line with the current applied methodology. Please revise all of the report. In addition, the monitoring parameter is presented twice. The both representation are in different (GEN _y and EG _{facility,y}). Please clarify.	~~CR-10~~ OK
B.6.2.3	Is the measurement equipment described? Is the accuracy of the measurement equipment addressed and deemed appropriate? Are the requirements for maintenance and calibration of measurement equipment described and deemed appropriate?	/1/ /10/ /11/	DR, CC	Two meters will be placed (one main and one back-up) at the project area. These meters will be sealed by TEIAS and intervention by project proponent is not possible. The accuracy of the measurement equipment is addressed in the PDD /1/. However, there is no information about the model, mark, serial no, accuracy of the electricity meters. In addition, there is no information about the calibration date of the electricity meters and an explanation that the electricity meters are still in appropriate. In calculating the net electricity generation, the monthly meter readings will be the base, and PMUM records will be used for the crosschecked.	~~CR-11~~ OK
B.6.2.4	Is the monitoring and recording frequency adequate for all monitoring parameters? Is it in line with the monitoring methodology?	/1/ /10/	DR, CC	The monitoring frequency of EG _{facility,y} is defined in Annex 3 of the PDD. However, for GEN _y , only recording frequency is defined. Please clarify.	~~CR-12~~ OK
B.6.2.6	How has it been assessed that the monitoring	/1/ /10/ /11/	DR,	Please refer to Section B.6.2 of this protocol.	~~CR-10~~

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
	arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design? Please confirm the ability of the project participants to implement the described monitoring plant.		CC		~~CR-11~~ ~~CR-12~~ OK
B.6.3 Monitoring of the GS indicators of sustainable development					
B.6.3.1	Does the monitoring plan include the GS indicators of sustainable development?	/2/ /6/ /7/	DR	After revising all the parameters related with the new scoring, (+) positive parameters should be added to the monitoring plan. All the parameters should be checked for the second crediting period and necessary ones should be added to the monitoring plan with their way of monitorings "How, When and By Who".	~~CAR-6~~ OK
B.6.3.2	Does the monitoring plan give the way (how, when, by who) of monitoring of each GS indicator?	/2/ /6/ /7/	DR	Please refer to Section B.6.3.1 in Appendix A of this protocol.	~~CAR-6~~ OK
B.6.3.3	Does the monitoring plan give the future project target for the parameter?	/2/ /6/ /7/	DR	Please refer to Section B.6.3.1 in Appendix A of this protocol.	~~CAR-6~~ OK
B.6.4 Management/Quality Assurance/Quality Control					
B.6.4.1	Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)?	/1/ /33/	DR	The electricity generation and consumption is measured in line with the TEIAS rules and requirements /33/. The electricity generation supplied to the grid and electricity consumption from the grid is stored by PMUM on the web site. The Project owner has a password to access this data on the web site.	OK
B.6.4.2	Are the data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from the project can be reported ex post and verified?	/1/ /10/	DR	The data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by the project can be reported ex post and verified during the verification phase.	OK
B.6.4.3	Will all monitored data required for verification and issuance be kept for two years after the end of the crediting period or the last issuance of CERs, for this project activity, whichever occurs later?	/1/	DR	All data will be kept for at least two years after the crediting period as mentioned in the PDD version 01 /1/.	OK
C.1 Crediting period					
C.1.1	What is the expected crediting starting date of the proposed project activity? Does the crediting period start eight week after the request for registration?	/1/	DR	The project is already listed in GS registry. The first crediting period is finished and the start date of the second crediting period is defined as 07/03/2015. However, according to the Gold Standard Procedures for the Renewal of a Crediting Period, "The start date of the renewed	~~CAR-7~~ OK

Checklist Question		Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
				<i>crediting period is defined as the first day after the end date of the previous crediting period, provided the application for a renewal of the crediting period is submitted to Gold Standard prior to the end of the previous crediting period.</i> <i>In the case when the application for renewal of the crediting period is not submitted to Gold Standard prior to the end of the previous crediting period, but is submitted within one year, then the start date of the renewed crediting period will be the date when the 4-week review period ends. The reason for delay in the submission of the application for renewal of the crediting period has to be justified by the Project Representative.</i> <i>If the application for renewal of the crediting period is not submitted to Gold Standard within one year after the end of the previous crediting period, the crediting period will not be renewed."</i> Since the project documentation is not submitted to Gold Standard, but may submitted within one year, then the start date of the renewed crediting period will be the date when the 4-week review period ends. The crediting period start date should be revised as per the submission of the documentation.	
C.1.2	What is the length of the crediting period? Is it clearly defined and reasonable?	/1/	DR	The length of crediting period is defined as 7 years. It is clearly defined that the project activity is in the second crediting period.	OK
D.1 Environmental impacts					
D.1.1	Has an analysis of the environment impacts of the project activity been undertaken? Is it clearly and sufficiently described in the PDD?	/1/	DR	The environmental impacts are discussed in the PDD. EIA not required certificate is prepared on 11/12/2012 for the project activity.	OK
D.1.3	Is the analysis of the environmental impacts required by the legislation of the host Country? If yes, has the EIA has been approved by local Government? Does the approval contain any conditions that need monitoring?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section D.1.1 of this protocol.	OK
D.1.4	Is it the project in line with the current environmental legislation in the host Country?	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section D.1.1 of this protocol.	OK
D.1.5	Is the monitoring of sustainable development	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section D.1.1 of this protocol.	OK

Checklist Question	Reference	MoV ¹	Comments	Conclusion
			indicators/ environmental impacts warranted by legislation in the host country?	
D.1.6	/1/	DR	Please refer to Section D.1.1 of this protocol.	OK
E.1 Local stakeholder consultation				
E.1.1	/1/	DR, I	The stakeholder meeting was held on 25/07/2007 for the first crediting period. There is no need to perform another stakeholder meeting for the second crediting period since there is no compliance from the stakeholders during the first crediting period. In addition, according to the interviews with the stakeholders during the previous verification and the re-validation period performed by RINA, no negative feedback is received. A clear explanation is also given in the PDD.	OK
E.1.2	/1/	DR, I	Please refer to Section E.1.1 of this protocol.	OK
E.1.3	/1/	DR, I	Please refer to Section E.1.1 of this protocol.	OK
E.1.4	/1/	DR, I	Please refer to Section E.1.1 of this protocol.	OK
E.1.5	/1/	DR, I	Please refer to Section E.1.1 of this protocol.	OK

TABLE 2 RESOLUTION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS AND CLARIFICATION REQUESTS

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
CAR 1 In Section B.3 of the PDD; it is mentioned that “In the following, the investment analysis is applied to clearly demonstrate that the project activity is unlikely to be financially/economically attractive without the revenue from the sale of VERs”. However, in Step 2 of the same part of the PDD, it is mentioned that “Investment analysis is not applied”. Please clarify.	B.4.1 B.4.2 B.4.4	PDD has been revised accordingly.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> The explanation is now revised as “the barrier analysis is applied to clearly demonstrate that the project activity is unlikely to be financially/economically attractive without the revenue from the sale of VERs”. <u>Hence, CAR 1 is closed.</u>
CAR 2 In calculating the capacity or output range as +/-50% of the total design of the project activity, 60 MW is chosen. However, in choosing the output range in the calculation given in the excel sheet /2/, “project production capacity” is used instead of “installed power”. Please clarify. In addition, please clarify that if the N_{all} is found as “0” zero in the calculations, how can N_{diff} found as “1”.	B.4.6	Common practice has been revised. Also PDD has been revised. In the calculations, installed capacity is chosen. Both N_{all} and N_{diff} are equal to “0”.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> The “installed power” is now used for the calculation of common practice. The excel sheet and also PDD is revised as per the new calculation. <u>Hence, CAR 2 is closed.</u>
CAR 3 The defined the GS indicators in the SD matrix should include the chosen parameter, baseline and future target for the new crediting period. Please check all the parameters and discuss them for the second crediting period.	B.4.8.3	PDD has been revised accordingly. Response to Review 1 (19/01/2016): Water Quality and Quantity: Water quality and quantity parameter is added to the monitoring parameters. Air Quality: Sox and NOx statements have been removed from the text. Soil Condition: It has been added to the monitoring parameters	<u>Review 1 (05/01/2016):</u> Water Quality and Quantity: Since it is defined in the SD matrix that the project activity does not have any negative impact to ground or surface water, the transfer of wastewater by sewage truck should be monitored by invoices in the monitoring plan. Air Quality: In SD Matrix, first it is defined that Sox, NOx and VOC emissions are avoided by use of wind power and then it is defined that CO and NMVOC will be calculated. Please clarify. Soil Condition: To confirm that the wastes are collected by the municipality and no negative impact is occurred, this parameter should be monitored by a letter

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
			from municipality in every monitoring period. <u>Hence, CAR 3 is not closed.</u> <u>Review 2 (20/01/2016):</u> Water Quality and Quantity: The parameter is now added to the monitoring plan. Air Quality: SO_x and NO_x are now removed from the explanation and clearly stated that CO and NMVOC will be monitored. Soil Condition: The parameter is now added to the monitoring plan. <u>Hence, CAR 3 is closed.</u>
CAR 4 OM Calculation Option (a) simple OM is selected to calculate the operating margin (OM) emission factor of the grid as per the tool since the average share of electricity generation by low-cost/must-run plants for five most recent years is found to be less than 50%. The ex-ante option is selected for OM, from the years 2011 to 2013. However, more recent data is available in the TEIAS Statistics. Please revise the calculation.	B.5.1 B.5.4	OM has been re-calculated according to the latest data. Response to Review 1 (19/01/2016): Links have been revised.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> In "Total CO2 for OM" excel sheet, the given links are not revised as per the given most recent data of 2014. <u>Hence, CAR 4 is not closed.</u> <u>Review 2 (20/01/2016):</u> In "Total CO2 for OM" excel sheet, the given links are not revised as per the given most recent data of 2014. <u>Hence, CAR 4 is closed.</u>
CAR 5 Please check and revise all the parameters that are available at validation with their links and values according to the most recent data. In addition, please be sure that the links are in line with the given calculation excel sheet.	B.6.1	PDD has been revised accordingly. Response to Review 1 (19/01/2016): PDD has been revised.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> Most recent data (2014) is still not used in the calculations. Therefore, there is no revision for the links and values in the calculation excel sheet. <u>Hence, CAR 5 is not closed.</u> <u>Review 2 (20/01/2016):</u>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
			All the links are now revised in the PDD and the calculation excel sheet, <u>Hence, CAR 5 is closed.</u>
CAR 6 After revising all the parameters related with the new scoring, (+) positive parameters should be added to the monitoring plan. All the parameters should be checked for the second crediting period and necessary ones should be added to the monitoring plan with their way of monitoring "How, When and By Who".	B.6.3	Related revisions have been made.	<u>Review 1 (05/01/2016):</u> All the parameters related with the new scoring, (+) positive parameters are now added to the monitoring plan. All the parameters are checked for the second crediting period and necessary ones are added to the monitoring plan with their way of monitoring "How, When and By Who". <u>Hence, CAR 6 is closed.</u>
CAR 7 The project is already listed in GS registry. The first crediting period is finished and the start date of the second crediting period is defined as 07/03/2015. However, according to the Gold Standard Procedures for the Renewal of a Crediting Period, <i>"The start date of the renewed crediting period is defined as the first day after the end date of the previous crediting period, provided the application for a renewal of the crediting period is submitted to Gold Standard prior to the end of the previous crediting period."</i> <i>In the case when the application for renewal of the crediting period is not submitted to Gold Standard prior to the end of the previous crediting period, but is submitted within one year, then the start date of the renewed crediting period will be the date when the 4-week review period ends. The reason for delay in the submission of the application for renewal of the crediting period has to be justified by the Project Representative.</i> <i>If the application for renewal of the crediting period is not submitted to Gold Standard within one year after the end of the previous crediting period, the crediting period will not be renewed."</i> Since the project documentation is not submitted to Gold	C.1.1	According to the conditions, related dates and calculations will be revised. However, for the time being the dates are not changed. Response to Review 1 (19/01/2016): PDD and CM excel file have been revised. An estimated date is taken as the start date of the second crediting period as 01/04/2016. According to the GS review date, documents may be revised.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> The explanation is found acceptable. However, since the application for a renewal of the crediting period is not submitted to Gold Standard prior to the end of the previous crediting period, and the application for renewal of the crediting period is submitted within one year, then the start date of the renewed crediting period will be the date when the 4-week review period ends. Therefore, the start date of the new crediting period will be revised. <u>Hence, CAR 7 is not closed.</u> <u>Review 2 (20/01/2016):</u> The determined start date of the second crediting period is found acceptable. If there are changes with the dates, this will be explained during the first verification period. <u>Hence, CAR 7 is closed.</u>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
Standard, but may submitted within one year, then the start date of the renewed crediting period will be the date when the 4-week review period ends. The crediting period start date should be revised as per the submission of the documentation.			
CR 1 The title of the project activity is defined as “Yunttag MW Wind Power Project, Turkey” in the PDD version 06 of 22/10/2015 /1/ which is not in line with the GS Registry. Please correct.	A.1.1	PDD has been revised.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> The title of the project activity is now corrected as “Yunttag Wind Power Project, Turkey” in the PDD which is in line with the GS Registry. <u>Hence, CR 1 is closed.</u>
CR 2 “Clean Development Mechanism Project Design Document Form (CDM-PDD), version 01.0 is applied. The version of the PDD is the latest version when it is submitted to GS. However, the provided PDD is not in line with the CDM-PDD version 01.0 formats. Please check.	A.1.2	PDD has been revised.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> The provided PDD is now in line with the CDM-PDD version 01.0 formats. <u>Hence, CR 2 is closed.</u>
CR 3 Please clarify the listed issues: - The format of the dates should be revised as DD/MM/YYYY. - Please provide the GS Feedback Document related with the previous verification report.	A.2.1	- Format of the dates has been revised. - GS Feedback Document is provided.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> - The format of the dates is now revised as DD/MM/YYYY. - The GS Feedback Document related with the previous verification report is now provided to the validation team. There is a FAR raised by GS. This FAR is added to protocol for not to miss anything during the next verification period. <u>Hence, CR 3 is closed.</u>
CR 4 The project participant has been listed in tabular form in Section A.3 as “Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S.”. It is consistent with the current situation. However, it is not discussed in the PDD that the project proponent is private or public entity.	A.3.1	It has been added to the PDD that the project proponent is private entity.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> It is now discussed in the PDD that “Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S.” is a private entity. <u>Hence, CR 4 is closed.</u>
CR 5	A.4.4	Operational lifetime of the project has been changed to 25 years in accordance	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u>

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
The expected operational lifetime of the project activity is defined as 20 years in the PDD. Please give a reference for the explanation. In addition, the turbine lifetime is not discussed in the PDD. Please clarify.		with the related tool. Also, turbine lifetime is stated as minimum 20 years in accordance with the equipment supplier's brochures.	The expected operational lifetime of the project activity is now defined as 25 years as per the tool. In addition, the turbine lifetime is now discussed in the PDD with a given reference as 20 years. Hence, CR 5 is closed.
CR 6 The project activity is not used public funding for the financing of the project as confirmed via interviews. However, the signed ODA declaration is not provided to the validation team.	A.5	ODA Declaration has been provided. Response to Review 1 (19/01/2016): ODA declaration has now been provided.	Review 1 (24/12/2015): ODA declaration is still not provided to the validation team. Hence, CR 6 is not closed. Review 2 (20/01/2015): ODA declaration is now provided to the validation team. Hence, CR 6 is closed.
CR 7 The proposed project activity applies "ACM0002 Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 16.0.0 as indicated in the PDD /1/. The applied methodology is approved by CDM. However, in some parts of the PDD, the version of the methodology is defined as version 15.0. Please clarify.	B.1.1	PDD has been revised accordingly.	Review 1 (24/12/2015): The version of the methodology is now presented correctly in the PDD. Hence, CR 7 is closed.
CR 8 The "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality, version 05.0.0" defined in Section B.1 of the PDD is not the latest version. Please clarify.	B.1.2	PDD has been revised accordingly.	Review 1 (24/12/2015): The "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality, version 06.0.0" defined in Section B.1 of the PDD is now the latest version. Hence, CR 8 is closed.
CR 9 The timeline of the project is discussed in the PDD /1/. However, there is no explanation about the time of the second crediting period. Please add.	B.4.3.3	Second crediting period has been added to the Milestone	Review 1 (24/12/2015): The time of the second crediting period is now added to milestone. Hence, CR 9 is closed.
CR 10	B.6.2.2	PDD has been revised.	Review 1 (24/12/2015):

Corrective action and/ or clarification requests	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants	Validation conclusion
The monitoring plan includes all necessary data and parameters ex-post required by the applied methodology /10/ and the applicable methodological tool /11/. The only parameter included to the monitoring plan is "Quantity of Net Electricity Delivered to the Grid (GEN _y)". However, the name of the parameter is not in line with the current applied methodology. Please revise all of the report. In addition, the monitoring parameter is presented twice. The both representation are in different (GEN _y and EG _{facility,y}). Please clarify.	B.6.2.6		The parameter is now revised as per the applied methodology. The duplicated present is now removed from the report. <u>Hence, CR 10 is closed.</u>
CR 11 Two meters will be placed (one main and one back-up) at the project area. These meters will be sealed by TEIAS and intervention by project proponent is not possible. The accuracy of the measurement equipment is addressed in the PDD /1/. However, there is no information about the model, mark, serial no, accuracy of the electricity meters. In addition, there is no information about the calibration date of the electricity meters and an explanation that the electricity meters are still in appropriate.	B.6.2.3 B.6.2.6	PDD has been revised. Related documents are provided to the DOE. Response to Review 1 (19/01/2016): An explanation about the control mechanism is made by the project owners. Related e-mail is provided to the validation team.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> The information about the model, mark, serial no, accuracy of the electricity meters are now presented in the PDD. However, there is no information about the calibration date of the electricity meters and an explanation that the electricity meters are still in appropriate. <u>Hence, CR 11 is not closed.</u> <u>Review 2 (20/01/2016):</u> A clear definition is now given for the electricity meters. The calibration date of the meters are now defined as 05/12/2013 as confirmed through the first index protocol. <u>Hence, CR 11 is closed.</u>
CR 12 The monitoring frequency of EG _{facility,y} is defined in Annex 3 of the PDD. However, for GEN _y , only recording frequency is defined. Please clarify.	B.6.2.4 B.6.2.6	GEN _y statement is removed. EG _{facility,y} and related information is defined.	<u>Review 1 (24/12/2015):</u> The monitoring frequency of EG _{facility,y} is now defined in the PDD. <u>Hence, CR 12 is closed.</u>

TABLE 3 FORWARD ACTION REQUEST

Forward action request	Reference to Table 1	Response by project participants Validation conclusion
FAR 1 The PP shall monitor the bird strikes more frequently to cover the next monitoring period as a whole. Onsite feedback shall be collected at least on a yearly basis. The verifying DOE shall check and validate the validity of the feedback on the next monitoring period.	A.2.1	Frequency for the written statement from the muhtar has been changed to “annual” basis from “each verification”. RINA Opinion: This parameter will be monitored during the verification period.



RINA

CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra:
We declare that Mr/Ms/Ms:

Tugce Kiratli

è qualificato come¹:
is qualified as:

VCS/GS-TEC, VCS-VAL, VCS-VER, GS-VAL, GS-VER,
GS-TL, VCS-TL, SCS – TEC, SCS-VAL, SCS-VER, SCS-
TL

per le seguenti aree tecniche:
for the following technical areas:

1.2, 13.1

AREE TECNICHE TECHNICAL AREAS	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION	SCOPO SETTORIALE SECTORAL SCOPE
1.2	Energy generation from renewable energy sources	1
13.1	Waste handling and disposal	13

in accordo alle istruzioni della Divisione Certificazione.
in accordance with the instructions of the Certification Division.

REVISIONE REVISION	DATA DATE	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE REASON FOR THE REVISION
0	26/11/2012	-
6	08/06/2015	Update qualification according new AS 6.0

Il Resp. QPT
Head of QPT

¹ Legend:

VAL: Validator
VER: Verifier
TEC: Technical Expert
TL: Team Leader
FIN-EXP: Financial Expert
DET: Determiner

CDM: Clean Development Mechanism
VCS : Verified Carbon Standard:
GS: Gold Standard
SCS: SocialCarbon Standard
JI: Joint Implementation

DET: RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato da UNFCCC, quale Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM, da VCSA per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS, da GS Foundation, per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GS, da Ecologica Institute per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SCS

RINA Services S.p.A. is accredited by the UNFCCC, as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects, by the VCSA, to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects, by the GS Foundation, to carry out Validation and Verification of GS Projects and by the Ecologica Institute, to carry out Validation and Verification of SCS Reports



RINA

CERTIFICATO DI QUALIFICA QUALIFICATION CERTIFICATE

Rekha Menon

Si attesta che il sig./sig.ra:
We declare that Mr/Mrs/Ms:

è qualificato come¹:
is qualified as:

CDM-TEC, -VAL, -VER, -TL

per le seguenti aree tecniche:
for the following technical areas:

1.2, 2.1, 13.1, 13.2, 14.1

AREE TECNICHE TECHNICAL AREAS	DESCRIZIONE DELL'AREA TECNICA TECHNICAL AREA DESCRIPTION	SCOPO SETTORIALE SECTORAL SCOPE
1.2	Renewables	1
2.1	Energy Demand	2
13.1	Solid Waste and wastewater	13
13.2	Manure	13
14.1	Afforestation and reforestation	14

in accordo alle istruzioni della Divisione Certificazione.
in accordance with the instructions of the Certification Division.

REVISIONE REVISION	DATA DATE	MOTIVAZIONI PER LA REVISIONE REASON FOR THE REVISION
0	06-03-2008	-
10	22-12-2014	Update qualification according to AS ver.6.0

Il Resp. QPT
Head of QPT

¹ Legend:

VAL: Validator
VER: Verifier
TEC: Technical Expert
TL: Team Leader
FIN-EXP: Financial Expert
DET: Determiner

CDM: Clean Development Mechanism
VCS : Verified Carbon Standard:
GS: Gold Standard
SCS: SocialCarbon Standard
JI: Joint Implementation

DET: RINA Services S.p.A. è accreditato da UNFCCC, quale Entità Operativa Designata (DOE), per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti CDM, da VCSA per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti VCS, da GS Foundation, per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di Progetti GS, da Ecologica Institute per condurre la Validazione e la Verifica di rapporti SCS

RINA Services S.p.A. is accredited by the UNFCCC, as Designated Operational Entity (DOE), to carry out Validation and Verification of CDM Projects, by the VCSA, to carry out Validation and Verification of VCS Projects, by the GS Foundation, to carry out Validation and Verification of GS Projects and by the Ecologica Institute, to carry out Validation and Verification of SCS Reports