

QUALITY REPORT

Atik WPP

CT-373 · I-REC · Turkey

Report ID: CM-852466F9 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

Only minimal project identifiers are available; no official project documents were found in the extracted record. As a result, additionality, baseline setting, monitoring/verification quality, and any safeguards cannot be substantiated, creating high uncertainty and elevated over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	CT-373
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	2023
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), so key quality claims cannot be verified
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record

~ Renewable energy is typically low reversal risk, but permanence/buffer provisions are not documented here

No official documents were available in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage treatment, and any material findings or corrective actions cannot be confirmed. For an avoidance renewable energy project, integrity hinges on credible baseline/grid factor and robust MRV, but these elements were not found. Given the evidence gap, the score is conservative.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB/assurance details, monitoring period, or error checks were found in the extracted record

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

The extracted record contains no verification/assurance body name, monitoring period, or quantified checks (e.g., claimed vs verified emission reductions). With zero documents captured and low extraction confidence, there is insufficient basis to assess MRV quality or registry completeness beyond the basic identifier provided.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record

- Baseline and grid/emissions factor assumptions were not found, increasing over-crediting risk

Key claim-safety indicators—such as CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, and controls against double claiming—were not found in the extracted record. Baseline and emissions factor assumptions (critical for renewable energy crediting) are also not documented here, increasing the risk that claims could be overstated or not comparable to best practice.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- No evidence documents were captured (0 documents used), indicating severe documentation gaps

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing confidence in any missing/partial fields

No evidence documents were captured (0 documents used), and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability or missing sources. This is a severe documentation deficiency that prevents substantiation of core quality attributes and should trigger conservative scoring. (Gate note: documentation below 3.0 would cap transparency post-scoring.)

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Low reversal risk type, but not documented
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the core I-REC documentation set (registration, production/issuance records, audit/assurance statement, and monitoring/measurement procedures) so baseline and MRV can be evaluated

→ Disclose third-party assurance details (auditor/VVB, monitoring period, any findings/corrective actions) and explicitly state CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim prevention measures

Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-852466F9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy