VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.

ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY

IN

TURKEY

MONITORING PERIOD:
From 01/08/2017 – 22/05/2022 (both days included)

PROJECT NUMBER: 1003

Organizational Unit:	Re Carbon Ltd.		
Project Title:	ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY		
Project Number:	**Client:**		**Current MR Version:**
1003	VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.		0~~4~~3
Date of First Issue:	**Date of Current Version:**	**Version Number:**	**Number of Pages:**
21/02/2023	12~~03~~/0~~3~~5/2023	0~~3~~3	78
Verification Number:	**Registration Number:**	**Monitoring Period:**	
02	GS2542	From: 01/08/2017	To: 22/05/2022

Summary:

Host Country: Turkey

Project is Reviewed Against:

☒ Kyoto Protocol ☒ UNFCCC CDM rules and regulations and associated documents

☒ Gold Standard rules and regulations ☐ Other (Please Specify)

Methodology: ACM0002 **Version:** 15

Verified Emissions Reductions: 149,953 tCO_2e

Project Size: ☒ Large Scale ☐ Small Scale ☐ Micro Scale

Project Developers:	VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.

Verification Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Verification Findings:

During the verification 16 Corrective Action Requests and 00 Clarification Requests were issued, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this verification report. No Forward Action Requests were issued during the verification, all of which shall be addressed during the next verification of the project activity.

In summary, it is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY" in Turkey, is in compliance with the monitoring plan described in the registered PDD, version 05 and dated 29/09/2015. The GHG emission reductions are calculated correctly as per the applied methodology and the emission reductions given in the monitoring report version ~~03~~ 04 dated ~~03/03/2023~~09/05/2023 are fairly stated.

Verification Team Leader:	Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK	**Indexing Terms:**
Verification Team Members:	Ms. Selen CİLASUN – VV Trainee Ms. İrem TAŞKİRAN – VV Trainee	☒ No distribution without permission of the client or responsible organizational unit
Approved By	**Name:** / **Signature:**	☐ Limited Distribution

(Technical Reviewer):	Mr. Anil SÖYLER		☐ Unrestricted Distribution

Abbreviations

CAR : Corrective Action Request
CDM : Clean Development Mechanism
CEF : Carbon Emission Factor
CER : Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL : Clarification request
CO_2 : Carbon dioxide
CO_2e : Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA : Designated National Authority
DOE : Designated Operational Entity
DR : Document Review
EF : Emission Factor
ER : Emission Reductions
ERPA : Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement
FAR : Forward Action Request
GHG : Greenhouse gas(es)
GS : Gold Standard
GS4GG: Gold Standard for Global Goals
GWP : Global Warming Potential
I : Interview
IPCC : Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
kWh : Kilo Watt Hour
MP : Monitoring Plan
MoV : Means of Verification
MW : Mega Watt
MWh : Mega Watt Hour
NGO : Non-governmental Organisation
ODA : Official Development Assistance
PDD : Project Design Document
PD : Project Developer(s)
tCO2e : Tonnes of CO2 equivalents
UNFCCC: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY– VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. performed the 2nd verification of the "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY", a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number "GS2542" for the period in between 01/08/2017 and 22/05/2022. The scope of the activities cover the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in the Monitoring Report Version ~~03~~04, dated ~~03/03/2023~~ 09/05/2023 of "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY".

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY" in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD version 05, dated 29/09/2015. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is ACM0002 Version 15.0, "Large-scale Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources".

Re Carbon Ltd. confirms the following based on the results of document review and on-site assessment:

The implementation of the project has resulted in the avoidance of 149,953 tCO2e during the monitoring period in between 01/08/2017 and 22/05/2022.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Through a contract, dated 07/12/2022, Re Carbon Ltd. was appointed by "VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş." to perform the 2nd verification of the "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY". The objective of this verification activity was to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report version "~~03~~04", dated "~~03/03/2023~~ 09/05/2023" conforms with the requirements of the monitoring plan of the registered PDD and the approved methodology
- if the project activity conforms with the monitoring report and the registered PDD, and
- if the data reported in the monitoring report are complete and transparent.

2.2. Scope

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review of the monitored GHG reductions. The verification activity is based on the validated and registered PDD version 05, dated 29/09/2015.

The project activity and the monitoring report are assessed against the requirements of Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, CDM Modalities and Procedures as agreed on in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1, the annexes to that decision, "ACM0002 Version 15.0, "Large-scale Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", subsequent decisions and guidance made by COP/MOP and the CDM Executive Board as well as other related rules, according to the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0, GS Toolkit version 2.2 and other relevant GS requirements.

The only purpose of the verification and certification is its usage during the issuance process as part of the GS project cycle. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the verification and certification opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

2.3. Description of the Project Activity

The "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY" is operated by "VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.". The project activity is located in Çeşme District of İzmir Province, Turkey. The project activity has 6 turbines with 3 MWm/2.67 Mwe unit capacity. Total capacity is 18 MWm/16 MWe. Annual electricity generation is calculated as 53.572.000 kWh which is transmitted to the national grid at Çeşme RES transmission line.

The construction start date of the project activity was 02/01/2014. The first crediting period is from 23/05/2015-22/05/2022 (both days included). The start date of commissioning is 23/05/2015 and is accepted as the CP start date. The initial monitoring period is from 23/05/2015-31/07/2017 (both days included). The total electricity generation value of the current monitoring period is 267,204.90 MWh. The total achieved emission reductions of the current monitoring period is 149,953 tCO_2e.

The approved deviation request dated 06/01/2023 by GS states that “the first and second crediting periods can be continuous without any gap.”

2.4. Parties Involved

VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş. is the project participant and host country is Turkey. The project company name has been changed as VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş. on 05/07/2019 however the project owner is same. The generation license shows the name change.

2.5. Verification Period Covered

This is the 2nd verification period from 01/08/2017- 22/05/2022 (both days included).

3. METHODOLOGY

The verification of this GS project activity includes the following steps:

- Assessment of the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PDD, dated 29/09/2015 version 05
- A physical site visit, executed on 13/02/2022 in order to assess that all physical features of the project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and that the project developer has operated the project activity in line with the registered PDD.
- Assessment of the compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology ACM0002 Version 15.0, "Large-scale Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources".
- Assessment of the compliance of the monitoring with the monitoring plan
- Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions
- Issuance of the verification report
- Independent technical review
- Approval of the verification report and request for issuance

The Verification Protocol is used for the assessment of each requirement during the execution of verification activities and is given in Annex-1 of this verification report.

The Verification Protocol consists of two tables:

- Table 1 (CDM-Monitoring Report (MR)-FORM, and CDM and GS Verification Requirements)
- Table 2 (Resolution of Corrective Action, Forward Action and Clarification Requests)

The usage description of Table-1 in the Verification Protocol is explained in Table 3-1 below:

Table 3-1: Explanation of Table-1 in the Verification Protocol

Question	Reference	MoV*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft & Final Conclusion
The requirements related with the GS monitoring report, and CDM verification Standards and/ or Procedures	Gives reference to the legislation or documents where the relevant requirement is found	Explains how conformance with question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are Document Review (DR), Interview (I) and Not Applicable (NA)	Is used to elebarote and discuss the question and/or conformance to the question by giving related references and document sources based on which the finding is issued or evidence is checked	Either acceptable based on the evidence provided (OK), non-compliance with the requirement (CAR), further clarification (CL) due to insufficient, unclear or not transparent information, forward action request (FAR) that needs to be solved during the next periodic verification

The usage description of Table-2 in the Verification Protocol is explained in Table 3-2 below:

Table 3-2: Explanation of Table-2 in the Verification Protocol

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Verification Team	Ref. to Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
The all CL, FAR and CARs determined during the draft verification report should be listed here	Gives reference to the checklist questions in Table-1 of Verification Protocol	Is used to summarize the responses by project developers regarding the non-conformities	Is used to summarize the responses by verification and their conclusions

The Verification Protocol is filled out by the verification team in line with the descriptions above. All CARs, CLs and FARs are listed in a transparent and clear manner.

3.1. Verification Team and ITR Selection

The appointment process of the verification team takes into account the technical area(s), sectoral scope(s), and relevant host country experience required by the team members for the verification of the emission reductions achieved by the project activity in the related monitoring period for this verification. The relevant GS verification and previous ITR experiences are also assessed during the selection of the team members as well as the Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR). The verification team and ITR was assigned to this

verification activity on 02/12/2022, taking all the above factors into consideration and following the contract review procedure.

The verification team and ITR details are given in Table 3-3 below:

Table 3-3: Verification team and ITR details

Name	Role	Host Country Experience	Scope Coverage	Technical Expertise	Involvement*
Mrs. Fikriye Seda Atabek	Team Leader	☒	☒	☒	A, DR, R
Ms. Selen CİLASUN – VV Trainee	VV Trainee	☒	☒	☒	A, DR, SV, R
Ms. İrem TAŞKİRAN – VV Trainee	VV Trainee	☒	☒	☒	A, DR, SV, R
Mr. Anil SÖYLER	ITR	☒	☒	☒	ITR

* Explanations for the abbreviations used for involvement types are as follows:

A : Administrative
DR : Desk Review
SV : Site Visit
R : Reporting
ITR : Independent Technical Review

3.2. Desk Review of Documents

The basis for the verification activity is the monitoring report version 01, dated 30/01/2023, which was submitted to the verification team on the same day. This monitoring report was revised several times due to issued CARs and CLs, resulting in version 043, dated ~~03/03/2023~~ 09/05/2023 as the final version. The monitoring report and the monitoring activities were assessed against the registered PDD, version 05, dated 29/09/2015, the ACM0002 Version 15.0, "Large-scale Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", the relevant CDM rules and regulations, CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0, GS Toolkit version 2.2, and the following:

- Registered PDD, dated 29/09/2015, version 5
- Registered Passport, dated 23/12/2015

The following actions were involved in the desk review:

- A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions

A list of all the documents that were reviewed can be found in Section 6 of this verification report.

3.3. On-Site Visits

As a part of the verification activities a physical site visit was performed at the project activity's site, details of which can be seen in Table 3-4 below:

Table 3-4: Site visit details

Date	13/02/2022	
Location	İzmir	
Participant	**Company Name**	**Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit**
İlhan Çeneli	Vega Enerji	Plant Manager
Erman Kaya	Vega Enerji	General Manager
Sıla Duran	Sekans	Consultant
Dilan Özalp	Vega Enerji	Office Personnel-Female
Sibel Can Dinç	Vega Enerji	Office Personnel-Female
Cengiz Yaman	İnönü Village	Muhtar
Önder Soman	Musalla Village	Muhtar
Rahmi Sezer	Ovacık Village	Coffee Shop Owner
Mehmet Koç	Ovacık Village	Muhtar
Selen Cilasun	Re Carbon Ltd.	VV Trainee
İrem Taşkıran	Re Carbon Ltd.	VV Trainee
Seda Atabek	Re Carbon Ltd.	Lead Verifier

Points Verified	**Source of Information**
Implementation and operation of the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD	Document review, on-site visit and interviews with the local stakeholders from Musalla, İnönü and Ovacik Village
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters	Document review, on-site visit and interviews with the local stakeholders from Musalla, İnönü and Ovacik Village
Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PDD	Interviews with the local stakeholders from Musalla, İnönü and Ovacik Village
Cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources	Document review and on-site visit
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices	Document review, on-site visit and interviews with the local stakeholders from Musalla, İnönü

against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology	and Ovacik Village
Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions	Document review
Identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	Document review and interviews with the local stakeholders from Musalla, İnönü and Ovacik Village

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Verification Protocol

During the verification period, a Verification Protocol (attached as Annex 1 to this verification report) was used to submit the findings to the project developers.

In line with the CDM Validation and Verification Standard the team reports the non-conformities in form of Corrective Action Requests (CARs), Clarification Requests (CLs) and Forward Action Requests (FARs). When and for which type of non-conformities CARs, CLs and FARs are issued is explained below:

- The Verification team raises a **CAR** if one of the following occurs:
  - A non-conformity with the monitoring plan or methodology is found in the monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient.
  - Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impair the estimate of emission reductions.
  - Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification have not been resolved by the project developers.
- The Verification team raises a **CL** if information is insufficient, not transparent, or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM and/or GS requirements have been met.
- The Verification team raises a **FAR** during the verification for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

According to these principles, a total of 16 CARs, 00 CLs and 00 FARs were issued, all of which are listed in the Verification Protocol.

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews

During the verification period, follow-up interviews were performed by the verification team in order to further analyze the correctness and accurateness of the information provided. A list of individuals interviewed is given in Section 5 of this Verification Report.

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues

During the verification activity, CARs and CLs were issued to clarify the issues that are not sufficiently transparent to reach a positive verification opinion and to approve the achieved GHG emission reductions.

If there are any findings issued as Forward Action Requests (FARs) previously, as indicated in earlier validation and/or verification reports, these are also addressed in this phase.

Outstanding issues indicated in the FARs from earlier reports, and CLs and CARs from this verification activity, were resolved and/ or clarified during the written and oral communications between the Project Developer and Re Carbon Ltd.'s Verification Team Members. These communications are backed up with objective evidence that were sent to the verification team as a proof of compliance. Concerns issued in the desk review, the on-site audit assessments, the follow up interviews and the responses provided for the issued concerns are documented in Annex 1 (Verification Protocol) in order to guarantee the transparency of the verification process.

The verification timeframe is given in detail in Table 3-5 below:

Table 3-5: Verification Timeframe

Activity	Timeline		Total Days
	From	To	
Desk Review	30/01/2023	30/01/2023	1
Review of the MR version 01	30/01/2023	30/01/2023	1
Site Visit	13/02/2022	13/02/2022	1
Issuance of the Verification Protocol version 01	14/02/2022	14/02/2022	1
Review of PDs Initial Set of Responses	16/02/2022	16/02/2022	1
Issuance of the Verification Protocol version 02	-	-	
Review of PDs Second Loop Responses	-	-	
Closing of all the CARs and CLs	16/02/2022	16/02/2022	1
Issuance of the Verification Report version 01	21/02/2022	21/02/2022	1
ITR Process	22/02/2023	06/03/2023	13
Issuance of the Verification Report version 02	06/03/2023	06/03/2023	1
Submission for Final Approval	06/03/2023	06/03/2023	1
Submission to the PD	06/03/2023	06/03/2023	1

Information or clarifications provided as a response to a CAR, CL or FAR could also lead to a new request. This can also be seen transparently in the Verification Protocol provided in Annex 1 of this Verification Report.

3.7. Internal Quality Control

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report and its annexes must undergo an internal quality control in Re Carbon Ltd. This quality control is also referred to as the “Independent Technical Review” process.

The Independent Technical Review is performed by another Team Leader who was not involved in the verification activity of this project activity. Following finalization of the Verification Report by the Team Leader, the draft report is sent to the Independent Technical Reviewer. At this stage not only the report but all the supporting documents, such as emission factor calculations, additionality justifications, relevant excel sheets etc. are being reviewed.

Further CLs and CARs can be issued by the Independent Technical Reviewer during this review to cover all aspects that may need further clarification.

After all the CLs and CARs are closed, the verification report is reviewed and approved by the Team Leader, ITR and the Certification Manager. The request of issuance is submitted to the Gold Standard in line with the positive verification opinion and along with all relevant documents.

4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1. Remaining Issues from Previous Validation or Verifications

There is a grievance for this project that is available at (https://www.goldstandard.org/our-work/grievances/non-conformity-allegations-against-%C3%A7e%C5%9Fme-wind-power-project-turkey-gs2542). Gs has reviewed the grievance with the investigation of a local and independent expert and prepared a "ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSES TO GRIEVANCE" dated 31/10/2022. There are 5 FARS in this document which have been reassesed as below during verification of second monitoring period:

Forward Action Request 1:

Regarding the need that all risks identified by stakeholders are clearly discussed and mitigation planned and monitored over the remaining crediting period

During verification process for the entire and remining crediting period, the comments and responses raised in section C.3. Assessment of comments from all consultations above of the aforementioned Stakeholder Consultation Report shall be verified to confirm and ensure that continues implementation of the mentioned activities are in place and provide sustainable action and continuous implementation.

VVB Assessment for MP2:

Comments and responses raised in section C.3. Assessment of comments from all consultations above of the aforementioned Stakeholder Consultation Report are tabulated below:

Stakeholder comment	Explanation/ Justification (Why? How?)	VVB Assessment for MP2
As project area proposes protection in the remote fields, illegal hunting has been decreased and animal population of wildlife is observed to be increased.	Security staff which is operating 24/7 and installed surveillance system, discouraging any illegal activity in the isolated fields that project area lies on.	Security personnel are employed 24/7 and verified on site. Stakeholders also confirmed during SV that illegal hunting has been decreased. There are no more concerns about this issue on site.
Project is positive for animal grazing opportunities.	Project had built access roads on mountain which made shepherds to be able to navigate easier,more and farther to access vegetated lands.	Stakeholders also confirmed during SV that project built extra access roads. Project site is accessible by animals. VVB confirms that there is no negat,ve effect on grazing, in fact effect is positive.

Project had increased the quality of employment prioritizing locals and recruiting opportunities for internships.	Project currently employs 6 males and 2 females with technical and unqualified roles.	During SV, VVB interviewed the 2 female employees and other local employees. Stakeholders confirmed that priority is given to locals. 6 employees are working on site and 5 at the office in İzmir, all locals. Sibel Candinç- Female Local Employee from İzmir-Accountant 15 years of employee, Positive discrimination is done for female students for traineeship. Dilan Özalp-Office Admin – Female Local Employee from İzmir Has been working since 10 years. Female employees have no additional comments. Local employment has been seen on site.
Project existence on the solitary mountain prevents any water contamination by illegal dumping.	Security staff that is operating 24/7and installed surveillance system, discouraging any illegal activity in the isolated fields that project area lies on.	Security personnel are employed and verified on site. Stakeholders also confirmed dumping to water resources has been decreased.
No impact observed on soil condition, as performing agriculture on lands nearby.	Project being a wind power plant, no positive or negative impact on soil quality has been assumed.	No complaints regarding agricultural activities during SV.
Very little noise can be detected when the weather is windy.	Project being on the mountain, with distance to settlements of minimum 800 meters, has no impact on noise or shadow	No complaints regarding noise during SV.

	flickering.	
Location of the project is not ideal. Agricultural activities on fields shall be preferred rather than energy projects.	Project being a wind power plant has no impact on agricultural activities around, nor the transmission line. Considering Turkish energy generation profile, it is needed to sustain electricity production to reduce reliance on imports. Compared to fossil fuel resources dominating the national grid, renewable energy projects are nature friendly.	Stakeholders hesitated at first impression that turbines would harm the agricultural lands but when operation started they saw that turbines do not affect the lands. Currently all stakeholders approve the project and are happy about it. Stakeholders confirmed this during SV.
Would like to have these meetings more often	Continuous input mechanism and grievance means welcomes any feedback at any time. Moreover, following monitoring periods, verification site visits are mandatory, allowing to get together with stakeholders for interviews on project impacts.	Continuous input mechanism and grievance is seen in place during SV. Logbooks have been delivered and stakeholders confirmed communication is easy with PP. Logbook photos are attached. Besides there is the wish submission portal on the company website (https://www.vegaenerji.com/eng/wishes-views-platform/)
Cheap electricity for farmers and locals	Project supplies electricity to the national grid and distribution companies appointed by government are responsible for electricity prices for end-users.	Locals have to buy electricity from grid, this is the only legal way.

VVB confirms that during SV for MP2, all above points have been verified in a satisfactory way. VVB therefore closes this FAR.

Forward Action Request 2:

The project shall update the project documents and resolve inconsistencies in different documents.

PD shall ensure that this is performed during next verification process based on the information mentioned in the investigation report section 4.5 (b) iv. "Some minor inconsistencies were found in project documents and validation report – such as referring to wrong distances between nearby city and project site, using a slightly wrong map, not referring to monitoring parameter, etc. During the discussion, the verifying VVB confirmed that the project and wind turbine locations were crossed check with GPS coordinates and information was found accurate"

VVB Assessment for MP2:

During SV, VVB and PP marked in Google Earth the villages, turbines and other relevant points. Distances between nearby city and project site: Google earth screenshot is produced together with PP and VVB during verification. The screenshot shows the İnönü Village in red circle above. The below circle shows the Musalla Village which also includes the plant location. Below arrow shows the closest registered house in Ovacik Village (1 km away from plant). The center of Ovacik is even further away. Turbine locations are also seen in screenshot as blue dots. VVB approves that the screenshot is correct and proves the project location.

Forward Action Request 3:

The Verification Body at next verification process shall ensure that all documents that sustain the information provided in the Stakeholder Consultation Report are available and in accordance with the statements included in such report.

Additionally, the legal court case situation shall be verified and confirmed by the VVB during verification assessment, in particular during physical site assessment to confirm that legal situation of the project land is closed.

VVB Assessment for MP2:

Stakeholder Consultation Report evidences:

During EIA process before CP1 Validation, LSC meeting was held in Ovacik Village because the nearest village with a proper meeting place was there. However it is seen that Ovacik has not any interaction with the project. Musalla and İnönü Villages are closer to project site and project is located on the lands of these 2 villages. The repeated LSC meeting was held in İnönü Village and Musalla Stakeholders were also interviewed which is much more appropriate.

PP is providing trainee opportunity for technical high school students (Please find protocol attached- Sevgi Reha Aysal Protokolu)

The environmental reports are publicly available at https://www.vegaenerji.com/eng/our-environmental-reports/

Reports have been investigated by VVB. None of the reports state any problems.

The legal court case situation:

Regarding the EIA process courts: Former stakeholder Madeleine Staaf Kura raised a court to stop expropriation process claiming that power plants would conflict with tourism activities that they planned to invest in. The court however decided that energy investments were of priority and tourism plans were cancelled. Please see evidence by court attached (İzmir 5th court, Decision numbered 2016/969, pg 12). Later this stakeholder sold all her land at her own will to a Turkish citizen (not local) on 14/12/2021. VVB therefore closes this FAR.

Forward Action Request 4:

The project should successfully complete the verification demonstrating compliance with all the requirements.

VVB Assessment for MP2:

All requirements and above points have been checked by VVB. There has been no remaining problems. VVB therefore closes this FAR.

Forward Action Request 5:

The verifying VVB must conduct a physical on-site visit and interview the local stakeholders

VVB Assessment for MP2:

SV done physically. VVB therefore closes this FAR.

4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD

The project is fully implemented according to the description presented in the registered PDD and 6 turbines were operational during the on-site visit as in the registered project. The verification team confirms through the site visit inspection and provided evidences that all physical features of the project activity including data collecting systems and storage are implemented in accordance with the registered PDD. Electricity meters were also seen during the site visit. The project activity is completely operational and the same has been confirmed through the site visit.

The project was operational on 22/05/2015 as confirmed with the provisional acceptance protocol.

According to the registered PDD, the estimated annual emission reduction is 30,068 tCO2e and corresponding total estimated amount for the monitoring period is 144,653 tCO2e. The actual values achieved for the current monitoring period is 149,953 tCO2e. The actual amount of emission reduction for the current monitoring period is 3.7% more than estimated emission reduction amount.

The difference in the values does not lead to a substantial increment of the ER in this period in relation to the estimates in the registered PDD and therefore does not affect the additionality of the project.

4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology, ACM0002 Version 15.0, “Large-scale Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”, applied by the project activity.

In line with the methodology, the only information to be monitored is the amount of net electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity.

4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan

EGfacility, y: The net electricity is measured continuously by two power meters. The meters used are in line with the regulatory requirements for electricity meters. Current meter is installed on 01/08/2017. The meters were tested on 19/09/2020 during the monitoring period. Calibration requirements are in line with legal regulations. The meters were not changed during the monitoring period.

	Main Meter	Spare Meter
Brand	EMH	EMH
Serial Number	4213167	4213168
Accuracy Class	0.2 S	0.2 S

The electricity meters have been controlled and maintained by the grid owner. The quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid has been calculated with the EPIAS (the financial settlement center of TEIAS) records provided to the PP by TEIAS. All readings and billings are done via EPIAS system which is the legal database of the Ministry. EPİAS records are considered as the main source for the net electricity and the values are crosschecked with the data measured by meters.

There are always internal reviews of the metered data which is checked by different parties. SCADA system is available from which daily reports are taken. The data collected daily is saved in plant manager computer and backed up. Sample log books were checked and there were no differences in data.

VVB approves that the actual monitoring complies with the registered monitoring plan.

4.5. Completeness of Monitoring

All parameters required by the methodology and Gold Standard are monitored. In line with the methodology, the only information to be monitored is the amount of net electricity exported to the grid by the project activity.

As there are no missing parameters, monitoring is complete.

4.6. GS4GG Safeguarding Principles and Requirements

GS4GG template is not used for the project activity. The project owner stated that since the project has not passed the transition process yet, the first monitoring report has been prepared over the old version. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that CDM-MR-Form can be used for this monitoring period.

Sustainability measures are in line with Section G of the registered Gold Standard Passport. Compliance check of the parameters indicated in the sustainability monitoring plan of the registered GS Passport and transition annex has been carried out, as follows below:
The sustainable development indicators indicated in the GS passport relevant for the 2nd periodic verification are:

- Air quality-Amount of CO and NMVOC emission reductions: According to latest official data CO and NMVOC emissions due to electricity generation in 2012 are: 0.160 tons/GWh and 0.034 tons/ GWh respectively. The amount of avoided emissions are as below: CO= 42.75 tons NMVOC=9.08 tons. Calculations have been checked by VVB and found appropriate.
- Water quality and quantity- Amount of Wastewater discharged to the environment: Wastewater produced by workers during operation is not released to the environment but collected in an impermeable septic tank and periodically transferred by sewage truck. The payment receipt of the transferred wastewater has been provided to VVB on site.
- Amount of Avoided Wastewater Discharge by Project Activity per year (x1000 m3/y): 2371,37,027.49 m3 of waste water has been avoided. Calculations have been checked by VVB and found appropriate.
- Biodiversity- Number of observed bird strikes: An ornithology report dated in October 2012, bat monitoring reports dated in March 2017 and September 2017 also proves that there isn't any negative impact by the project activity. Project coordinator appointed by the Project Owner monitors and then inform bird/bat carcasses and nests in site. In case of any case, he reports to the management in his reports. Annual declarations signed by the coordinator have been provided to the VVB.
- Quality of employment - Health & Safety Trainings: Employees were trained for: Theoretical and practical safety instructions, Usage of fire control tools, First Aid, Occupational and health and safety. Training records have been provided to VVB.
- Quantitative employment and income generation- Number of jobs created and Expropriation: The company provides job opportunities and as a result increase income generation. 8 people have been hired during the operation of the power plant. Social security records have been provided to VVB.
- Balance of payment and investments: Amount of payment for natural gas to be imported for electricity generation: Total Payment Avoided for Natural Gas Import by the Project During Monitoring Period: 5,001,435 Euro and Amount of Avoided Imported Natural Gas by Project Activity During Monitoring Period: 24,234,731 m3. Calculations have been checked by VVB and found appropriate.

Besides, VVB has inspected on site waste management activities and observed a clean storage site and proper waste collection. Waste disposal evidences regarding 2017-2021 have been submitted to VVB. These evidences prove that waste oil is treated as a hazardous waste and sent to registered companies by registered trucks for disposal. This is inline with Turkish Regulations.

Interviewed employees and stakeholders also declared that there has been no work related injury in this plant.

Based on the on-site visit observations, handled interviews and provided documents, it can be confirmed that sustainability parameters are monitored in line with the registered Monitoring Plan and registered GS Passport and that all the key sustainable development indicators defined in the registered sustainability monitoring plan have been considered properly.

4.7. Compliance with the Calibration Frequency Requirements for Measuring Instruments

During validation calibrated meters were installed as per the regulations. The initial calibration of the electricity meters were done on 01/08/2017. Although, re-calibration is required after ten years, nevertheless, in case of irregular difference between main and cross-check spare meters, TEIAS responsible are informed for the intervention. That means, TEIAS is responsible for the calibration and maintenance of the devices.

All documents regarding meter quality and test have been presented.

All data collected as part of monitoring will be archived electronically by the project owner and be kept at least for 2 years after the end of the last crediting period.

4.8. Assessment of Data and Calculation of Emission Reductions

EPIAS records were presented to the VVB for all months of the monitoring period. All data in emission reductions table are checked with EPIAS records. EPIAS records are the main data source whereas meter readings have been utilized as the cross check data source. The net electricity generated during the current monitoring period was as follows in Table 4-2 below:

Table 4-2: Net electricity generation

Period	Amount	Compliance check
2017 Vintage (01.08.2017-31.12.2017)	Export to Grid: 24,144.00 MWh Import from Grid: 26.85 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 24,117.15 MWh	Monthly EPIAS records, cross check with meter readings
2018 Vintage (01.01.2018-31.12.2018)	Export to Grid: 50,749.91 MWh Import from Grid: 74.55 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 50,675.36 MWh	Monthly EPIAS records, cross check with meter readings
2019 Vintage (01.01.2019-31.12.2019)	Export to Grid: 55,257.41 MWh Import from Grid: 66.08 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 55,191.33 MWh	Monthly EPIAS records, cross check with meter readings
2020 Vintage (01.01.2020-31.12.2020)	Export to Grid: 54,930.00 MWh Import from Grid: 65.38 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 54,864.62 MWh	Monthly EPIAS records, cross check with meter readings
2021 Vintage (01.01.2021-31.12.2021)	Export to Grid: 59,663.31 MWh Import from Grid: 54.41 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 59,608.90 MWh	Monthly EPIAS records, cross check with meter readings
2022 Vintage (01.01.2021-	Export to Grid: 22,773.21 MWh Import from Grid: 25.66 MWh	Monthly EPIAS records, cross check with meter

Period	Amount	Compliance check
22.05.2022)	Net electricity supplied to grid: 22,747.55 MWh	readings
Total	Export to Grid: 267,517.83 MWh Import from Grid: 312.93 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 267,204.90 MWh	Monthly EPIAS records, cross check with meter readings

VVB confirms that the data used for emission reductions are correct. The grid emission factor taken is 0.5612 tCO2/MWh and the value is same as fixed ex-ante in the registered PDD.

VVB also confirms that the methods and formulae used for calculating baseline emissions are in line with the methodology and the registered PDD. The net electricity generation is multiplied with the grid emission factor to arrive at the emission reductions.

The grid emission factor and data and parameters available before validation are also applied in line with the registered PDD and baseline excel sheet for validation.

VVB has checked the I-REC Registry (https://v-1.evident.app/Public/ReportDevices/), wherein 385 projects from Turkey are listed as of the validation report date and this project isn't available within I-REC Registry database. Similarly, VCS project database (http://vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/home) and GCC project database (https://projects.globalcarboncouncil.com/pages/submitted_projects) were checked and this project isn't available within VCS and GCC projects' databases, either. Given that CDM projects are not applicable in Turkey and the project does not appear on domestic REC scheme, I-REC and VCS registries, it could be confirmed that no RECs and other VER carbon credits are being issued for the project at the time of this validation.

4.9. Quality of Evidence

According to the PDD, the estimated emission reduction for this monitoring period would be 144,653 tCO_2e corresponding to the monitoring period. However, the project in operation totally reached 149,953 tCO_2e in this period.

The vintage break-up of the emission reductions during the current monitoring period was as follows in Table 4-3 below:

Table 4-3: Emission Reduction Values

Period	Emission reductions (tCO_2e)
2017 Vintage (01.08.2017-31.12.2017)	13,535
2018 Vintage (01.01.2018-31.12.2018)	28,439
2019 Vintage (01.01.2019-31.12.2019)	30,973
2020 Vintage (01.01.2020-31.12.2020)	30,790
2021 Vintage (01.01.2021-31.12.2021)	33,453

2022 Vintage (01.01.2021-22.05.2022)	12,766
Total	**149,953**

Calculations have been reproduced by VVB and the source data (EPIAS records) are presented by PP.

4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance

There are in total two electricity meters (main meter and back up meter) attached to the power plant for measurement of the generated electricity which were installed to the plant. The meters used in the power house are in line with the Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EMRA) requirements for the electricity meters. Both these meters are bi-directional (meter the energy in two directions – consumption and production). If there is a measuring difference between main and back-up meters and one of the parties (TEIAS or the PP) requests for calibration of the meters, in this case, the meters will be calibrated without waiting for the periodical check. This calibration process is made by an accredited party under the control of TEIAS and the PP is not responsible for calibration of the meters in Turkey according to the local standards and requirements.

4.11. Materiality

Verification VVB checked all data set (EPIAS records from 01/08/2017- 22/05/2022) and each day of production is included in these readings. These readings are exact and are the basis for billing. They are recorded and saved automatically by the relevant government authority and there is no base for any option of material information.

Level of materiality is ensured by application of “Guideline on the Application of Materiality in Verifications” version 02. To guarantee this level of assurance all data that is used in the GHG emission reduction calculations have been reviewed without any sampling.

4.12. Verification of Sampling Plan

No sampling approach is used.

4.13. Post Registration Changes

4.13.1. Temporary deviations

N/A.

4.13.2. Corrections

N/A.

4.13.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

N/A

4.13.4. Permanent changes

N/A.

4.13.5. Changes to the project design

N/A.

5. LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

The list of individuals who were interviewed during the verification period is given in Table 5-1 below:

Table 5-1: List of individuals interviewed

Reference Number	Means of Interview[1]	Full Name	Organization	Title
01	SV	İlhan Çeneli	Vega Enerji	Plant Manager
02	SV	Erman Kaya	Vega Enerji	General Manager
03	SV	Sıla Duran	Sekans	Consultant
04	SV	Dilan Özalp	Vega Enerji	Office Personnel-Female
05	SV	Sibel Can Dinç	Vega Enerji	Office Personnel-Female
06	SV	Cengiz Yaman	İnönü Village	Muhtar
07	SV	Önder Soman	Musalla Village	Muhtar
08	SV	Rahmi Sezer	Ovacık Village	Coffee Shop Owner
09	SV	Mehmet Koç	Ovacık Village	Muhtar
10	SV	Selen Cilasun	Re Carbon Ltd.	VV Trainee
11	SV	İrem Taşkıran	Re Carbon Ltd.	VV Trainee
12	SV	Seda Atabek	Re Carbon Ltd.	Lead Verifier

The local stakeholders stated in the Table 5-1 above were interviewed about the following issues and there were no complaints by the interviewed local stakeholders during the on-site visit:

- Grazing
- Noise due to the project activity
- Sufficiency of local employment
- Waste management practices implemented by PP
- Impact of the project on flora and fauna including bird life

[1] SV: Site visit; T: Telephone; EM: E-mail

- Land acquisition process of the project activity

It could be confirmed that there hasn't been any complaint during the monitoring period by the interviewed local stakeholders.

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The list of the documents which were reviewed during the verification period is given in Table 6-1 below:

Table 6-1: List of documents reviewed

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D01	Monitoring Report	v01	30/01/2023
D02	Monitoring Report	v02	16/02/2023
D03	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	v01	30/01/2023
D04	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	v02	16/02/2023
D05	EPIAS Records	-	2017-2022
D06	Meter Readings	-	2017-2022
D07	Electricity Meters First Index	-	28/05/2015
D08	Training records	-	18/02/2019, 28/04/2018, 22/05/2020, 08/04/2015, 30/03/2022, 08/10/2019, 26/05/2021, 12/01/2021
D09	Logbook Evidence	-	17/02/2023
D10	CDM Validation and Verification Standard For Project Activities	3.0	09/09/2021
D11	CDM Project Standard For Project Activities	3.0	09/09/2021
D12	ACM0002, “Large-scale Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”	15.0	-
D13	Contract Agreement	-	07/12/2022
D14	GS Passport	-	23/12/2015
D15	Registered PDD	5	29/09/2015
D16	Building permits	-	02/07/2018, 02/10/2018
D17	Protocol with technical high school	-	December 2021
D18	Waste disposal evidences	-	2017-2022
D19	Waste water disposal evidences	-	2017-2022
D20	2016-969 decision Court 5	-	02/02/2018
D21	Grievance_GS2542_SCReport	-	31/10/2022
D22	Verification Report MP1	1	12/02/2018

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D23	Monitoring Report MP1	6	12/02/2019
D24	Deviation Request	-	06/01/2023
D25	Stakeholder Consultation Report	-	15/08/2022
D26	Validation Report	-	23/12/2015
D27	Independent Observer Report	-	May 2022
D28	Local Employment Evidence	-	17/02/2023
D29	Screenshot of project items	-	-
D30	Honey Bee Report	-	December 2016
D31	Electromagnetic resonance report	-	2008-2014
D32	Electromagnetic Report	-	November 2015
D33	Ornithology Report	-	October 2016
D34	Ornithology Report	-	October 2012
D35	Landscape Repair Report	-	October 2012
D36	Landscape Repair Report	-	May 2014
D37	Noise Report	-	October 2020
D38	Sociology Report	-	-
D39	Dust Emission Report	-	2014
D40	Dust Emission Report	-	2016
D41	Bat Report	-	March 2017
D42	Bat Report	-	September 2017
D43	Monitoring Report	v03	03/03/2023
D44	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	v03	03/03/2023
D45	Carcass monitoring form	-	2016-2022
D46	License	-	11/03/2010
D47	Acceptances	-	May and June 2015
D48	Meter Test	-	19/09/2020
D49	Monitoring Report	v04	09/05/2023

7. VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK holds B.Sc. degree in “Chemical Engineering” and a M.Sc. degree in “Energy Science and Technology”. She is a lead auditor and trainer for ISO 50001 and since 2004 has been working in the fields of “Management systems”, “ISO 14064” and “Energy Management in Industry”. She has been involved in more than 100 GS and VCS projects as an ITR, Team Leader, Validator and Verifier. With re-carbon, Seda is a free-lance Team Leader, ITR and a TA 1.2, 2.1 & 3.1. expert. Seda is also a Regional Expert for Türkiye and China.

Ms. Selen CİLASUN holds a B.Sc. and a M.Sc. Degree in “Bioengineering”. With re-carbon, Selen is an internal Validator/Verifier, a TA 1.2 expert and a Regional Expert for Türkiye.

Mr. Anıl SÖYLER holds a B. Sc. in “Environmental Engineering” from Middle East Technical University/Ankara. He has more than 15 years of professional experience in environmental management, monitoring and auditing, environmental and social impact assessments, GHG emission reporting as well as projects’ validation and verification. He has been involved in the validation/verification services of more than 200 GHG emission reduction projects. Anıl has also been involved in both national and international projects, supported by IFC, the World Bank and EBRD. With re-carbon, Anıl is a free-lance Team Leader, ITR and TA 1.2 expert. Anıl is also a Regional Expert for China and Türkiye.

Ms. İrem TAŞKIRAN holds a B. Sc. in “Energy Systems Engineering” from Ankara Yıldırım Beyazit University. With re-carbon, İrem is an internal Validator/Verifier Trainee and a Technical Area 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 3.1 expert and a Regional Expert for Türkiye.

7.1. Appointment Certificates

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointments indicated below, the bearer may:

- Participate in assessments conducted by re-carbon Ltd.
- Take the appointed positions within and outside of an assessment team
- Bring specific expertise to assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated. There is no defined validity period for this Certificate. However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **01.08.2022** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mrs. Fikriye Seda Atabek

as a confirmation of compliance with re-carbon's internal qualification requirements for the following positions:

Gold Standard
Climate Security & Sustainable Development

Verified Carbon Standard
A VERRA STANDARD

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewable	08.02.2022	08.02.2022			08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.2: Energy distribution	08.02.2022	08.02.2022			08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.2: Energy demand	08.07.2022	08.07.2022			08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022	08.07.2022
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: Agriculture															

GCC

ICR International Carbon Registry

BioCarbon Registry

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewable	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022										
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.2: Energy distribution	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022										
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.2: Energy demand	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022										
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Turkey, China

R-C-18 / 28.04.2022 - 02

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointments indicated below, the bearer may:

- Participate in assessments conducted by re-carbon Ltd.
- Take the appointed positions within and outside of an assessment team
- Bring specific expertise to assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated. There is no defined validity period for this Certificate. However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **27.02.2023** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Ms. Selen Cilasun

as a confirmation of compliance with re-carbon's internal qualification requirements for the following positions:

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables					15.10.2022	10.01.2023	10.01.2023			15.10.2022	27.02.2023	27.02.2023			15.10.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables	27.02.2023	27.02.2023			15.10.2022	27.02.2023	27.02.2023			15.10.2022					15.10.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Türkiye (14.10.2022)

F-C-044 / 23.01.2023 - 00

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointments indicated below, the bearer may:

- Participate in assessments conducted by re-carbon Ltd.
- Take the appointed positions within and outside of an assessment team
- Bring specific expertise to assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated. There is no defined validity period for this Certificate. However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **03.08.2022** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mr. Anıl Söyler

as a confirmation of compliance with re-carbon's internal qualification requirements for the following positions:

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables	08-02-2021	08-02-2021		03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater	08-02-2021	08-02-2021		03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables															
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Turkey, China

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointments indicated below, the bearer may:

- Participate in assessments conducted by re-carbon Ltd.
- Take the appointed positions within and outside of an assessment team
- Bring specific expertise to assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated. There is no defined validity period for this Certificate. However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **28.02.2023** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Ms. İrem Taşkıran

as a confirmation of compliance with re-carbon's internal qualification requirements for the following positions:

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
	TA 1.2: Renewables					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
	TA 1.2: Renewables					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Türkiye (28.02.2023)

F-C-044 / 23.01.2023 - 00

8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. performed the 2nd verification of Gold Standard "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY", a project with the registry reference number "GS2542" for the period in between 01/08/2017 and 22/05/2022. The scope of our activities covers the verification and the certification of GHG emissions reductions, as reported in the Monitoring Report Version ~~03~~ 04 dated ~~03/03/2023~~ 09/05/2023 of "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY".

VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş. is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring Plan as indicated in the final PDD. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project are under the responsibility of the management of the Project. The development and maintenance of the records and the related monitoring procedures are in accordance with the Monitoring Report Version 0~~3~~4 dated ~~03/03/2023~~ 09/05/2023.

The verification was performed by a verification team consisting of "Fikriye Seda Atabek as the team leader, Selen Cilasun and İrem Taşkıran as VV Trainees and Anil Söyler as the ITR", and the project activity was checked against the applicable rules and regulations of CDM including Section I of CDM Modalities and Procedures, the relevant guidance and decisions of the COP/MOP, CDM EB and CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0, GS Toolkit version 2.2.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirm that the project activity "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY" in Turkey, was implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD version 05, dated 29/09/2015. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions were calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology ACM0002 Version 15.0, "Large-scale Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources".

Re Carbon Ltd. confirms the following, based on the results of the document review and the on-site assessment:

<table>
<tr><td>Project Title</td><td>ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY</td></tr>
<tr><td>Applicable Period</td><td>01/08/2017 – 22/05/2022</td></tr>
<tr><td>Baseline Emissions</td><td>149,953 tCO_2e</td></tr>
<tr><td>Project Emissions</td><td>0 tCO_2e</td></tr>
<tr><td>Leakage Emissions</td><td>0 tCO_2e</td></tr>
<tr><td>Emission Reductions</td><td>149,953 tCO_2e (GS-VERs)
<table>
<tr><td>2017 Vintage
(01.08.2017-31.12.2017)</td><td>13,534</td></tr>
<tr><td>2018 Vintage
(01.01.2018-31.12.2018)</td><td>28,439</td></tr>
<tr><td>2019 Vintage
(01.01.2019-31.12.2019)</td><td>30,973</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

	2020 Vintage (01.01.2020-31.12.2020)	30,790
	2021 Vintage (01.01.2021-31.12.2021)	33,452
	2022 Vintage (01.01.2021-22.05.2022)	12,765
	Total	149,953

Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK
Team Leader
~~03~~12/~~03~~05/2023

Mr. Anil SÖYLER
ITR
12/05/2023~~06/03/2023~~

Ms. Esin TUNALI
Certification Manager
12/05/2023~~06/03/2023~~

ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 – CDM-Monitoring Report (MR)-FORM, and CDM and GS Verification Requirements

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Cover Page					
1. Has the following information been provided on the cover page of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Please see in below.	OK	OK
1.1. Gold Standard project ID;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
1.2. Title of the project;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
1.3. Version number of PDDapplicable to this monitoring report;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
1.4. Version number of the monitoring report;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes, the version number is available.	OK	OK
1.5. Completion date of the monitoring report (DD/MM/YYYY);	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes, the completion date is available.	OK	OK
1.6. Date of the project design certification (DD/MM/YYYY);	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.7. Date of last annual report;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV= Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.8. Monitoring period number;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	First	OK	OK
1.9. Duration of this monitoring period (DD/MM/YYYY– DD/MM/YYYY));	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
1.10. Project representative(s);	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
1.11. Host country;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
1.12. Activity requirements applied;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
1.13. Methodology (ies) applied and version number;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
1.14. Product requirements applied;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
2. Has the achieved sustainable development contributions been summarized in Table-1 using the relevant tabular format provided?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
3. Has the product vintages been included in Table-2 using the relevant tabular format provided?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
A. Description of project					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
A.1. General description of project					
A.1.1. Has a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 provided under section A.1of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
A.1.2. Has the purpose of the project and the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	The purpose of the project has been provided in the Section A.1 of the MR.	OK	OK
A.1.3. Has a brief description of the installed technology and equipments been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
A.1.4. Has the relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Please provide a table of relevant dates	CAR1	OK
A.2. Location of project					
A.2.1. Has complete information on the location of the project activity, including town, city, country, map and GPS coordinates been provided under section A.2 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
A.3. Reference of applied methodology					
A.3.1. Has a complete reference of the methodology, referred tools and standardized baselines, if applicable, applied been provided under section A.3 including the version numbers and titles?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
A.4. Crediting period of project					
A.4.1. Has the crediting period including the crediting period start and end dates, choice and length of the crediting period been provided under section A.4 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Stated	OK	OK
B. Implementation of project					
B.1. Description of implemented project					
1. Has the installed technology(ies), technical process and equipment, including the diagrams, where appropriate, been included in section B.1 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM project standard for project activities	DR	Stated	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	§256a				
2. Has the information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity (including relevant dates, construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) been provided under section B.1 of the MR?	CDM project standard for project activities §256b	DR	Stated	OK	OK
3. If the project activity consists of more than one site, has the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site been clearly described under section B.1 of the MR?	CDM project standard for project activities §256b	DR, SV	The project consists of only one site.	OK	OK
4. If the implementation of the project planned to be realized in different phases, has the progress of the proposed GS project achieved in each phase been indicated under section B.1 of the MR?	CDM project standard for project activities §256b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
5. Do the actual project and its operation comply with the registered PDD?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §354a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
6. Have the PDs implemented and operated the GS project as per the descriptions contained in the registered PDD?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §354b	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.1.1. Forward action requests (FARs) identified during validation and/or previous verification					
B.1.1.1 Is there any remaining FARs from	GS4GG-MR-	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

	Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	the validation and/or previous verification activities?	FORM version 1.1 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §319c, 395h				
B.1.1.2	If there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities, have the PDs addressed these FARs in the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §320	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.1.1.3	Has the FARs been resolved?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §344d §346	DR	Please insert a title in MR for FARS	CAR2	OK
B.2.	**Post design certification (registration) changes**					
B.2.1.	**Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline**					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.1.1 Is it indicated whether any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring period?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM project standard for project activities §231 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §282	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.2 If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, have PDs described the nature, extent and duration of the non-conforming monitoring and the proposed alternative monitoring of the project activity in the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM project standard for project activities §231	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3 If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, do the description of deviations include the following?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.1 How it deviates from the monitoring plan and/or applied methodology(ies),	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.2 The duration for which the	GS4GG-MR-FORM	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
deviation(s) is(are) applicable	version 1.1				
B.2.1.3.3 Justification on the conservativeness of the approach.	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.4 If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, have PDs applied conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that GHG emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation?	CDM project standard for project activities §231a CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §284	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2. Corrections					
B.2.2.1 Has it been indicated whether there are any corrections to project information or parameters fixed at the registration?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §288	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.2 Is the corrected information an accurate reflection of actual project information?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §288a	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.2.3 Are the corrected parameters in accordance with the applied methodology, selected monitoring plan and/or the applied standardized baseline?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §288b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3. Changes to start date of crediting period					
B.2.3.1 Is it indicated whether any changes to the start date of the crediting period?	CDM project standard for project activities §235 §236 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §290	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4. Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline					
B.2.4.1 Is it indicated whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies or standardized baseline?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM project standard for project activities §238	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.4.2 If there are such changes, have they been listed providing the version number and completion date of the revised design certified (i.e., approved) PDD for each?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.3 Are the changes to the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD in compliance with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §296	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.4 Do the changes reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §297	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.5 If the permanent changes are likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, do the PDs apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the permanent change?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §298	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5. Changes to project design of approved project					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.5.1 Are there proposed or actual changes to the project design of the approved project?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §300	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.2 Do the actual changes comply with the monitoring plan, the applied monitoring methodology and tools and/or, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline, and/or the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §302	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.3 Does the revised PDD comply with the applied monitoring methodology and tools and/or standardized baseline or any later version of the methodology and/or standardized baseline or the requirements of another methodology and/or the standardized baseline that is applicable to the project activity?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §303	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4 Does the changes to project activity include the following?	CDM project standard for project activities §241	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.1 Increase in the capacity specified in the registered PDD with the following conditions:	CDM project standard for project activities §241a	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.5.4.1.1 If the project activity is large-scale: CERs may be claimed up to an amount calculated based on the increased capacity by 20 per cent of the capacity specified in the originally registered PDD; or	CDM project standard for project activities §241a (i)a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.1.2 If the project activity is large-scale: CERs may be claimed for the full amount calculated based on the increased capacity if the project developers can demonstrate that the reason for the increase is not within the control of the project developers;	CDM project standard for project activities §241a (i)b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.1.3 If the project activity is small-scale, CERs may be claimed for the full amount calculated based on the increased capacity, provided that the resulting project activity does not exceed the small-scale threshold for the corresponding small-scale project type (i.e., Type I, II or III);	CDM project standard for project activities §241a (ii)	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.2 Decrease in the capacity specified in the registered PDD;	CDM project standard for project activities §241b	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.5.4.3 Addition of new components or extension/addition of technologies/measures that introduce complimentary technologies/measures involving mass and/or energy transfer to/from the technologies/measures specified in the originally registered PDD;	CDM project standard for project activities §241c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.4 Removal of a component or technology/measure specified in the registered PDD;	CDM project standard for project activities §241d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.5 Changes to the technologies/measures that result in the same technologies/measures as in the originally registered technologies/measures	CDM project standard for project activities §241e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.6 Removal or addition of one or more site(s) of the project activity registered with multiple sites;	CDM project standard for project activities §241f	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.7 Removal of a project activity from a bundle of small-scale CDM project activities; methodologies, or voluntary change to other methodologies, provided all requirements in the updated/changed methodologies are met.	CDM project standard for project activities §241g	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.5.4.8 Actual operational parameters that are within the control of the project developers, differing from the expected parameters;	CDM project standard for project activities §241h	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.9 Any consequential changes to the application of methodologies, standardized baselines and/or other methodological regulatory documents resulting from the changes referred to in questions B.2.6.7.1-B.2.6.7.4 above	CDM project standard for project activities §241i	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4.10 Voluntary update of the applied methodologies or the other applied methodological regulatory documents to a later valid version of them, or voluntary change to other methodologies, provided all requirements in the updated/changed methodologies and the other applied methodological regulatory documents are met	CDM project standard for project activities §241j	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.5 Do the PDs report in the revised PDD the impacts of the proposed or actual changes to the registered project activity on the following:	CDM project standard for project activities §242	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.5.1 The applicability and application of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under	CDM project standard for project activities §242a	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
which the project activity has been registered;	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §303a				
B.2.5.5.2 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;	CDM project standard for project activities §242c CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §303c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.5.3 The level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity;	CDM project standard for project activities §242d CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §303d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.5.4 The additionality of the project activity;	CDM project standard for project activities §242e CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §303e	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.5.5.5 The scale of the project activity.	CDM project standard for project activities §242f CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §303f	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.6 In the case of investment analysis, have PDs modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity?	CDM project standard for project activities §243a CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §304a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.7 In cases where only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, have PDs demonstrated that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances?	CDM project standard for project activities §243b CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §304b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.8 If the PDs can't demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity has been	CDM project standard for project activities §245a (i)	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
registered, has PDs revised the PDD applying the latest version of the methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline?					
B.2.5.9 If another methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline is applied to the project activity, has PDs demonstrated compliance with the requirements of the selected methodology and/or the selected standardized baseline?	CDM project standard for project activities §245a-(ii)	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C. Description of monitoring system applied by the project					
C.1. Has a description of the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM project standard for project activities §258	DR	Provided	OK	OK
C.2. Has information about the data collection procedures, including following been provided under section C of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM project standard for project activities §258	DR	Provided	OK	OK
C.2.1. Information flow including data generation	CDM project standard for project	DR	Stated	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	activities §258				
C.2.2. Data aggregation	CDM project standard for project activities §258	DR	Yes, this is available.	OK	OK
C.2.3. Data recording	CDM project standard for project activities §258	DR	Yes, the data recording details are available.	OK	OK
C.2.4. Data calculation	CDM project standard for project activities §258	DR	Yes, this is available.	OK	OK
C.2.5. Data reporting	CDM project standard for project activities §258	DR	Yes, such details are available.	OK	OK
C.3. Has organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM project standard for project activities §258	DR	Stated	OK	OK
C.4. Regarding to the management and operational system, are the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §361b-(iv)	DR	Please see above	OK	OK
C.5. Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §361e	DR	This is in accordance with the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
C.6. Has line diagram(s) showing all relevant	CDM project standard for	DR	Stated	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
monitoring points been provided under section C of the MR?	project activities §258				
C.7. Have the monitoring plan been properly implemented and followed by the PDs?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §361a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.8. Has the monitoring of parameters (baseline / project / leakage / emission reduction) in the project activity been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD or any accepted revised monitoring plan?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §361b-(i)-(ii)-(iii)	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.9. Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM EB decisions been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §361b	DR	Yes, the monitoring parameters have been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD.	OK	OK
C.10. Are monitoring results consistently recorded and stored as per the approved frequency?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §361d	DR	Yes, the monitoring parameters have been implemented and recorded in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD.	OK	OK
D. Data and Parameters					
D.1. Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period					
D.1.1. Has all the data that is determined only once for the crediting period but	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Please revise format of footnote 8 of MR	CAR3	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

	Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	are used after registration of the project, been listed under section D.1 using the tabular format?					
D.1.2.	If all the data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project, does the listed data include all the parameters used to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and the monitoring plan?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK
D.1.3.	In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each SDG Indicator given in accordance with the approved PDD?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK
D.1.4.	In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the approved PDD and the applied approved methodology?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK
D.1.5.	In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the approved PDD and the	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

	Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	applied approved methodology?					
D.1.6.	In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the description of the data/parameters given in accordance with the approved PDD and the applied approved methodology?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK
D.1.7.	In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the source of the data/parameters given in accordance with the approved PDD and the applied approved methodology?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK
D.1.8.	In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the values applied of the data/parameters given in accordance with the approved PDD and the applied approved methodology?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK
D.1.9.	In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has it been indicated what measurement methods and procedures have been used?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK
D.1.10.	In the data/parameter tables	GS4GG-MR-	DR	Provided	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has it been indicated what the data/parameters are used for (baseline/project/leakage emission calculations)?	FORM version 1.1				
D.2. Data and parameters monitored					
D.2.1. Has all the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 of the MR using the tabular format?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.2. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the name of the SDG Indicator and data/parameters given in accordance with the approved PDD and the applied approved methodology?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	The units of monitored data/parameters have been provided.	OK	OK
D.2.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has it been described how the data is monitored?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	This has been available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.2.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the source of data been indicated (like logbooks, daily records, surveys, etc.)?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK
D.2.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the values of the monitoring parameter been indicated?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Provided	OK	OK
D.2.7. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the QA/QC procedures being applied been given?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.8. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has it been indicated what types of equipment are used to monitor each parameter, including following, if applicable as per the monitoring plan?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes, please see below.	OK	OK
D.2.8.1 Details on accuracy class	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	The accuracy class details are available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.8.2 Calibration frequency	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.2.8.3 Serial number	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	The serial numbers of the electricity meters are available.	OK	OK
D.2.8.4 Calibration date	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	available	OK	OK
D.2.8.5 Validity of the calibration	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	The about the validity of the calibration is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.9. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the measurement and recording frequency been indicated?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes, the measurement frequency has been provided.	OK	OK
D.2.10. Is the calibration frequency for measuring equipments specified in the monitoring methodology, in the applied standardized baselines or in the monitoring plan?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §370	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.11. If the calibration frequency for measuring equipments isn't specified in the monitoring methodology, in the applied standardized baselines or the monitoring plan, are the equipments calibrated either in accordance with the specifications of the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §370	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.12. If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are	CDM validation and verification standard for	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
available, have the international standards been used?	project activities §370				
D.2.13. Is the calibration of the measuring equipment that have an impact on the claimed emission reductions conducted by the PDs at a frequency specified in the applied monitoring methodology and/or the monitoring plan?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §371	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.14. Has the calibration been delayed and has the calibration been implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e., the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §366	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.15. If the calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e., the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, are one of the following approaches adopted by the PDs for the calculation of emission reductions?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §366	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.15.1 Applying the maximum permissible error of the instrument to the measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §366a	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
calibration, if the results of the delayed calibration do not show any errors in the measuring equipment, or if the error is smaller than the maximum permissible error; or					
D.2.15.2 Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test, if the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the measuring equipment.	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §366b	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.16. If calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, has the error been applied in following ways?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §367	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.16.1 The adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration result in fewer claimed emission reductions?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §367a	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.16.2 For all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §367b	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.17. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have Pss calculated the emission reductions conservatively?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §368	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.2.18. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have post registration requirements been followed by the PDs?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §369	DR	The calibration frequency is available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.19. Have any information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of emission reductions been given in detail in the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes, such information is available.	OK	OK
D.2.20. If the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 using the tabular format, does the listed data include all the parameters used to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and the monitoring plan?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM project standard for project activities §259	DR	Yes, such information is available.	OK	OK
D.2.21. Is a complete set of data available for the specified monitoring period?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §373	DR	Yes, such information is available.	OK	OK
D.3. Comparison of monitored parameters with last monitoring period					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.3.1. In case of community service activities, has the monitored parameters been stated and compared with the previous monitoring period?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2. In case of community service activities, has the short explanation for any values that have increased or are less conservative been provided?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.4. Implementation of sampling plan					
D.4.1. If data and parameters monitored described in section D.2 of the MR are determined by a sampling approach, has the description on how PDs implemented the sampling for those data and parameters according to the sampling plan been provided?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.4.2. If data and parameters monitored described in section D.2 of the MR	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
are determined by a sampling approach, has the following been included?	CDM Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §29 §30 §31 §32 §33 §39				
D.4.2.1 Description of implemented sampling design;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.4.2.2 Collected data (electronic spreadsheets may be attached and referenced);	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.4.2.3 Analysis of the collected data;	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.4.2.4 Demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met.	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.4.2.5 Demonstration that the samples were randomly selected and are representative of the population.	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E. Calculation of SDG Impacts					
E.1. Calculation of baseline value or estimation of baseline situation of each SDG impact					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.1.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the baseline value been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.1.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of baseline values been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Transition has not been completed yet	OK	OK
E.1.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Transition has not been completed yet	OK	OK
E.1.4. Have any assumptions used in baseline calculations been justified?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §373d	DR	Transition has not been completed yet	OK	OK
E.1.5. If applicable, are the appropriate factors used for the baseline calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g., IPCC default values and other reference values)	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §373e	DR	Transition has not been completed yet	OK	OK
E.2. Calculation of project value or estimation of project situation of each SDG outtcome					
E.2.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the project value been provided under section E.2 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.2.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of project values been provided under section E.2 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Transition has not been completed yet	OK	OK
E.2.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Transition has not been completed yet	OK	OK
E.2.4. Have any assumptions used in project calculations been justified?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §373d	DR	Transition has not been completed yet	OK	OK
E.2.5. If applicable, are the appropriate factors used for the project calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g., IPCC default values and other reference values)	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §373e	DR	Transition has not been completed yet	OK	OK
E.3. Calculation of leakage					
E.3.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the leakage value been provided under section E.3 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	The leakage emissions are taken as zero in line with the applied methodology	OK	OK
E.3.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of leakage values been provided under section E.3 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.3.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.4. Have any assumptions used in leakage calculations been justified?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §373d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.5. If applicable, are the appropriate factors used for the leakage calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g., IPCC default values and other reference values)	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §373e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4. Calculation of net benefits or direct calculation for each SDG impact					
E.4.1. Has all the net benefits as difference of baseline and project values or direct calculations for each SDG outcome provided under section E.4 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.4.2. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.5. Comparison of actual SDG impacts with estimates in approved PDD					
E.5.1. Has a comparison of actual values of the SDG impact of the project achieved during the monitoring period with the estimations in the approved PDD been given under section E.5 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1 CDM project standard for project activities §267	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.5.2. If the comparison of actual values of the SDG outcome of the project achieved during the monitoring period with the estimations in the approved PDD is given under section E.5 of the MR, has this comparison been given using the tabular format provided?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Transition has not been completed yet	OK	OK
E.6. Remarks on difference from estimated value in approved PDD					
E.6.1. Has an explanation of the cause of any increase in the actual values achieved during the current monitoring period (e.g. higher water availability, higher load plant factor, etc.), including all information (i.e. data and/or parameters) that is different from that stated in the approved PDD, been provided under section E.6 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
F. Safeguards Reporting					
F.1. Has the report on the safeguarding principles that were available the in monitoring plan been provided including the following?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Please revise statement "The payment receipt of the transferred wastewater will be provided to DOE on site Amount of Avoided Wastewater Discharge by Project Activity per year (x1000 m3 /y): 2371,3" Please calculate avoided wastewater discharge and balance of payments as per registered PDD Plese provide evidence on local employment	CAR4	OK
F.1.1. An update on the implementation including information on relative success and failures, or improvements to proposed mitigation measures	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
F.1.2. Monitoring and reporting on any key indicators identified, including against pre-set tolerances	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
F.1.3. Information on any assessment questions answered 'potentially' or where requirements call for regular re-assessment	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
G. Stakeholder Inputs and Legal Disputes					
G.1. List all inputs and grievances which have been received via the continuous input and grievance mechanism together with their respective responses/mitigations					
G.1.1. Is the list of all inputs/grievances which have been received for the project during the monitoring period together with their respective answers/actions provided in section G.1 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Please provide evidence of logbook Please revise date 13th September 2023.	CAR5	OK
G.2. Report on any stakeholder mitigations that were agreed to be monitored					
G.2.1. If there any remaining inputs/grievances from previous monitoring period where follow up action/mitigation measure is to be verified in this monitoring period from the validation and/or previous verification activities, have the PDs addressed these in section G.2 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
		DR	Yes	OK	OK
G.3. Provide details of any legal contest that has arisen with the project during the monitoring					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification *	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
period					
G.3.1. Has there been any legal contest or dispute that has arisen with the project during the monitoring period and are such details and resolution provided in section G.3 of the MR?	GS4GG-MR-FORM version 1.1	DR	NO	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Table 2 – Resolution of Corrective Action, Forward Action and Clarification Requests

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR1 Please provide a table of relevant dates	A.1.4	It's been added as Table 1.	Review 1: Ok Closed (Provided).
CAR2 Please insert a title in MR for FARS	B.1.1.3	It's been added.	Review 1: Ok Closed (Provided).
CAR3 Please revise format of footnote 8 of MR	D.1.1	It's been revised.	Review 1: Ok Closed (Provided).
CAR4 Please revise statement "The payment receipt of the transferred wastewater will be provided to DOE on site Amount of Avoided Wastewater Discharge by Project Activity per year (x1000 m3 /y): 2371,3" Please calculate avoided wastewater discharge and balance of payments as per registered PDD Plese provide evidence on local employment	F.1	The parameters have been revised accordingly.	Review 1: Ok Closed (Provided).
CAR5	G.1.1	The log book evidences have been provided to the VVB.	Review 1:

* CAR= Corrective Action Request, FAR= Forward Action Request, CL= Clarification Request

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
Please provide evidence of logbook Please revise date 13th February 2023.		Related section has been revised accordingly.	Ok Closed (Provided).
CAR-6 Please use the round down function vintage sub total ER values in the ER Excel.Please revise ER Excel, MR and verification report based on the first finding.Please inlcude vintage base values in the Section 8 of the report.	ITR	Related sections have been revised accordingly.	Review 1: OK Closed (Revised).
CAR-7 Please explain the monitoring period considering the site visit requirement in GS along with the approved deviation, if any.	ITR	It's been added under section A.1 as a footnote.	Review 1: OK Closed (Revised).
CAR-8 Please include the turbine reference details in the Section B.1 of the MR.	ITR	It's been added as a footnote.	Review 1: OK Closed (Revised).
CAR-9 Please include the current monitoring period in the Table 1 of the MR.	ITR	It's been added.	Review 1: OK Closed (Added).
CAR-10 Please include the brief roles and responsibilities of the personnel regarding the monitoring in the Section C of the MR.	ITR	Section C has been revised accordingly.	Review 1: OK Closed (Added).
CAR-11	ITR	The parameter has been revised accordingly.	Review 1:

* CAR= Corrective Action Request, FAR= Forward Action Request, CL= Clarification Request

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
Please include the meter test dates associated with the monitoring period in MR along with the relevant evidence. Please clarify if there is any meter change process during the monitoring period.			OK Closed (Added).
CAR-12 Please include EFgrid,CM,y parameter in the Section D.1 of the MR.	ITR	This was not stated as a parameter in PDD.	Review 1: OK Closed (Explained).
CAR-13 Please include in the MR whether the test/calibration of the meters is conducted in line with the relevant legal regulation/methodology.	ITR	It's been added.	Review 1: OK Closed (Added).
CAR-14 Please clarify why only initial meter test report has been referred in the verification report.	ITR	Test and index protocol have been provided.	Review 1: OK Closed (Added).
CAR-15 Please include the details of PP change in MR and provide evidence	ITR	It's been added under Section A1 as a footnote.	Review 1: OK Closed (Added).
CAR-16 Please provide acceptance	ITR	Provided.	Review 1: OK Closed (Provided).

* CAR= Corrective Action Request, FAR= Forward Action Request, CL= Clarification Request