

QUALITY REPORT

Selimoglu 9.3 MW HPP

GS-1102 · GS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-719A1892 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
■ Documentation (15%)	4.3

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a stated project baseline, and no quantified leakage deduction. However, the verification report also records many corrective and clarification requests, and reversal risk is not addressed, which weakens confidence in the crediting claims. Transparency is limited by missing usage-monitoring details, no claimed-vs-verified issuance comparison, and incomplete registry/eligibility information.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1102
Sector	other
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 version 09
Crediting Period	null
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Verified ERs	39,355 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The verification report lists 15 corrective action requests plus 18 clarification requests and 2 forward action requests, indicating substantial documentation and implementation issues.
- Reversal risk is not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is provided, which is a concern for a hydropower project.
- A contradiction exists on leakage treatment: one document indicates leakage was deemed negligible, while an earlier document reportedly quantified it; the later verification report was privileged because it is more recent.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the verification report.
- Reversal events are not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage is stated for permanence protection.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and says the leakage impact was deemed negligible, which supports the core crediting logic. At the same time, permanence is weakly documented because reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool share is provided. The large number of corrective and clarification requests in the Bureau Veritas report also suggests the project needed substantial follow-up before the verification could be finalized.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period is stated, and the project was verified by Bureau Veritas Certification.
- Usage monitoring method is not stated, and total claimed ERs are not available for comparison with the 39,355 verified ERs.

Transparency is mixed: the monitoring period is clearly stated and the project was verified by Bureau Veritas Certification, but key MRV details are missing. Usage monitoring method is not stated, total claimed ERs are not available, and the record does not provide a clear comparison between claimed and verified issuance. CORSIA eligibility is also not stated, limiting registry-level clarity.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + Leakage deduction is stated as 0%, and the report says leakage was deemed negligible.
- The project uses a project-specific baseline, and the leakage treatment is contradicted by an earlier document that reportedly quantified leakage.

Claim safety is moderate because the report states a 0% leakage deduction and treats leakage as negligible, which reduces over-crediting concerns. However, the baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized baseline, and the contradiction on leakage treatment reduces confidence. CCP status is not mentioned and CORSIA eligibility is not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 4.3 / 10

- + Four documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- The verification report contains 15 corrective action requests, 18 clarification requests, and 2 forward action requests, showing material documentation gaps.

Documentation quality is limited by the many corrective and clarification requests in the verification report, even though four documents were used and extraction confidence is medium. The crediting period is not stated, which makes it harder to judge recency and completeness against the monitoring period. The presence of FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing is positive, but the overall file still looks incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	0% deduction with contradiction
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete issuance reconciliation showing claimed versus verified ERs, along with the registry records and any retirement/transfer history.

→ Provide explicit permanence and leakage documentation, including buffer pool treatment, reversal monitoring, and the basis for the negligible leakage conclusion.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_07-01-10 to 30-06-12_v6.0.pdf
- GS Passport_26-04-11.pdf
- PDD_22-02-11.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1102
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1102
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_07-01-10 to 30-06-12_v2.0.pdf

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-719A1892 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy